A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE *LORD of DERRY* HIS Treatise of Schism:

Wherein he intends to cleare the Protestant Church from Schism, and to lay the fault upon the *Roman Church.*

By *R. C.* Doctor of Divinity.

1 John 2. *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for had they been of us, they would surely have remained with us.*

PARIS,
Printed in the Year M. DC. LV.

8° Z 180. Th

The Preface to the Reader requiſite to be read before the Book.

I. ALbeit my great age (gentle Reader) accompanied both with ſome want of health, and extreme want of neceſſary books, might perhaps, before men, excuſe me from ſaying anie thing to the Lord of Derrie his late Treatiſe, wherein he intends to free his Engliſh Proteſtant Church from Schiſm, & to prove, a *that the Court or Church of Rome is the cauſe of this Schiſm, and almoſt all other Schiſms in the Church*. Nevertheleſs, conſidering the great threats of God againſt watch-men (as I am) who ſee the ſword comming, and

a *Pag.* 229.

Ezech.33. 1 Cor.9. give not warning, and hearing the Apoſtle ſay of himſelf, *Woe to me, if I evangeliſe not*, 2 *Tim.*4. and command S. Timothy to preach *opportunely, importunely*, I have taken ſome pains to reade over the ſaid Treatiſe, and in three weeks ſpace made this briefe ſurvey of it, leſt if I deferred longer, the poiſon of it might ſpread farther, and become more incurable. And though I have not anſwered every particular thing in that Treatiſe, (as in truth it were needleſſe, ſeeing he brings nothing new, worth anſwering) yet I hope I have clearly ſhewed, that he hath not cleared his Engliſh Proteſtant Church from Schiſm, nor convinced the Court or Church of Rome of being cauſe of this Schiſm, or any other Schiſms in the Church. I have alſo briefly proved, that the Roman Church being a Catholike and *true Church, in ſub-*

ſtance

ſtance (as the L. of Derrie and Proteſtants commonly confeſſe) ſhe could not give them juſt cauſe to forſake her communion in Sacraments, as they have done, and therefore are true Schiſmaticks.

And that the Reader may more clearly ſee this, he muſt *Firſt point to be noted.* note, Firſt, that Schiſm is not an accidental, but ſubſtantiall diviſion, or a diviſion in ſome ſubſtantial part of the Church of God, and that her formal ſubſtantial parts are theſe: *Profeſſion of Faith, Communion in Sacraments, and lawfull Miniſtery.* Hence appears, that Schiſm is a moſt grievous crime, becauſe it tends to the deſtruction of the whole Church, the myſtical body of Chriſt, whoſe eſſence conſiſts in the union of all her ſubſtantial parts; and her deſtruction, in the diviſion of them: and alſo actually deſtroyeth that part of

the Church, which is divided: as to cut a limb from a man, or a branch from a tree, is to destroy them: Wherefore the Fathers well say, b Schism is a greater sin then Idolatry.

b *S. Augustl. 1. de Bap. c. 8. S. Optatus, l. 1.*

Secondly, that there cannot be given any true or just cause of c Schism, both because there can be no just cause of committing so great a sin, as also, because there can be no salvation out of the Church, more then was out of the Ark of Noe, and there can be no just cause to goe out of that, out of which there is no salvation. For as the d Fathers say: *None shall have God for Father who have not the Church for Mother.* Hence also appeareth,

c No just cause of Schism. See *l. 2. distinct fundam & non fuud. c. 13. n. 7.*

d *S. Cyprian. l. de unit. S. Austin. l. 4. de Bapt. c. 17. & l. 4. de Symbol. c. 13.*

peareth, how untruly L. D. cap. 8. ſaith, that the Church of Rome is the cauſe of this, and all other Schiſms, if he mean of a juſt cauſe, ſince there can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; and vainly, if he mean of an inſufficient cauſe, whence ſome may take occaſion to make a Schiſm, for ſuch cauſe will not excuſe from Schiſm.

2. The ſecond point to be noted, is, that Proteſtants have forſaken all theſe, *The Pope, The Papacie or Papal authoritie, The univerſal Roman Church, and al other ancient Chriſtian Churches* in their communion of Sacraments; For in Sacraments they communicate no more with anie ancient Church, Grecian, Armenian, Ethiopian, or what other ſoever, then with the Roman, and tha to clear themſelves from Schiſm, they muſt bring juſt cauſe for their ſeparation from everie one of theſe.

3. The third point is, that Protestants varie, in giving their pretended just cause of their separation from the Roman Church. For at first, the onely cause they gave, was the abuse of some, that preached Indulgences. Since, some give for a just cause, the adoration of the B. Sacrament or Communion in one kind, others the oath made by Pius IV. which they call a new Creed, and others other causes, as it seemeth fittest to satisfie the Persons with whom they deal: which varietie, is a certain sign of their uncertaintie of any true just cause of their separation.

4. The fourth point much to be noted is that the L. of Derrie confesseth, (as do also most Protestants, as I shewed elswhere) that *the*

c.6 p.159.c. 2 p 29.
d lib.1.de

Protest. c.2.l. distinct. fund.& non fund. 6.3. Plain confess. of Proces. c.3.

Roman

Roman Church is a true Church in ſubſtance; and her Religion, true in ſubſtance, and a Catholike Church, p. 246. and yet ſayeth, that ſhe hath given juſt cauſe to Proteſtants to forſake her Communion in Sacraments, and in her publike worſhip of God: which implieth plain contradiction. For it is in effect to ſay, that a Catholike & true Church in ſubſtance, can give juſt cauſe to forſake her ſubſtance. For the Roman Churches Communion in Sacraments & publike worſhip of God, is a ſubſtantial part of her, & to depart from a ſubſtantial part of a thing, is to depart from the ſubſtance therof, becauſe ſubſtances of things (as the Philoſopher ſaith truly) conſiſt *in indiviſibili*, as numbers do, and are changed by any addition or ſubtraction of any

A true Church in ſubſtance, can not give juſt cauſe to forſake her ſubſtance.

ny ſubſtantial part; and to alter any ſubſtantial part of a thing, is not to purge or reform it, but deſtroy it. So that, if a true Church in ſubſtance, ſhould give juſt cauſe to alter any ſubſtantial part of her, ſhe ſhould give juſt cauſe to deſtroy her ſubſtance. Beſides, it is plain blaſphemy to ſay, that a true Church in ſubſtance, can give juſt cauſe to depart from her Communion, or devide her in any ſubſtantial part, becauſe a true Church in ſubſtance, is in ſubſtance a ſpouſe of Chriſt, his miſtical bodie, his kingdome. And it is blaſphemy to ſay, that a ſpouſe of Chriſt, his miſtical bodie, his kingdome, can give juſt cauſe to forſake it, or alter it in any ſubſtantial part. And this point alone, if it be wel conſidered, wil ſuffice to confute all L.D. book, becauſe therein he (p. 29. 159. 246.) confeſſeth, that the Roman Church is *a true Church*

Church in ſubſtance and a Catholike Church, and to juſtifie Proteſtants from Schiſm in leaving her Communion in Sacraments, ſayeth withal, that ſhe hath given the Proteſtants juſt cauſe, to leave her Communion, and yet neither prove, nor attempt to prove, that a Catholike and true Church in ſubſtance, can give juſt cauſe to forſake her Communion in Sacraments, which is a ſubſtantial part of her ſubſtance. If therefore the Roman Church be a Catholike & true Church in ſubſtance, Proteſtants in leaving her Communion in Sacraments, have left the ſubſtance of a true Catholike Church, and ſo are plain Schiſmatiks, nor have purged or reformed the Roman Church, (as they pretend) but in part deſtroyed

L. D. never proveth that a true Church in ſubſtance can give juſt cauſe to forſake her ſubſtance

ſtroyed her, to wit, in that part which they have ſeparated from her Communion. Wherefore thus I argue; who ſeparate themſelves from the ſubſtance of a Catholike and true Church in ſubſtance, are true Schiſmatiks. Proteſtants have ſeparated themſelves from the ſubſtance of the Roman Church, which is a Catholike and true Church in ſubſtance, therefore they are true Shciſmatiks.

The fift point is, that ſome Proteſtants find it ſo hard to juſtifie their ſeparation from the Roman Church, as they impudently denie, that they are ſubſtantially ſeparated from her; as if to be ſeparated from her in all her formal ſubſtantial parts, namely in her profeſſion of faith, her communion of Sacraments, and her Officers, were not to be ſubſtantially ſeparated from her: Do they juſtifie, or rather

ther clearly condemn their ſeparation from the Roman Church, who denie a ſeparation from her in all her formal ſubſtantial parts, to bee a ſubſtantial ſeparation from her? And which the chiefeſt Proteſtants confeſs to be a ſubſtantial ſeparation from her, and glorie therein, as I have ſhewed l. 2. of the *Author of Proteſtancie* c. 11. Neither wil it help them to ſay, that they are not wholy out of the ſubſtance of the Roman Church, becauſe they hold divers things which are of the ſubſtance of the Ro. Church, becauſe to be either wholy or partly out of the ſubſtance of the Church, is to be truly out of the Church (becauſe the ſubſtance of a thing, is all its partes united,) and is damnable Schiſm; whereupon S. Anguſtin ſaid to the Donatiſts: e *In many things you were with me, in few things not*

e *In Pſalm.* 54. *ſee alſo Epiſt.* 48. *l.* 1. *de Baptiſ. c.* 8.

with

me, but if in few things you be not with me, the many things in which you are with me will not profit you. Besides, though Protestants be not wholy out of the Rom. Church in profession of faith, they are wholy out of her Communion in Sacraments, for they communicate not with her in any Sacrament, and we profes *Communionem Sanctorum*, and the f Fathers teach, that *Communion of the Church*, is necessarie to salvation.

f. *S. Aust. l. 1. de Bap. c. 8. S. Hicrom-epist. 5.7*

6 The last point I propose to the judicious Protestants, and careful of their souls, is, that though it were not evident, the Protestant Church is guiltie of Schism, yet seeing it cannot but seem doubtful, and uncertain; and on the contrarie, evident, that the Rom. Church is not Schismatical, because (as some

ſome g Proteſtants confeſs) *She never went out of any known Chriſtian ſocietie*, nor any Proteſtants can name and prove, that ſhe did: as it is evident and confeſſed, that the Proteſtants went out of the Roman, it is far ſurer to be free from Schiſm, to live and die in Communion of the Roman, then of the Proteſtant Church, and being far ſurer, ought lo be choſen of every judicious man careful of his ſalvation, rather then the far leſs ſure. And in doing otherwiſe he ſhold doe, not onely againſt Religion, but prudence, and charitie to his ſoul, and ſo as he would not doe in any thing, which concerneth his lands, libertie, honor, or life. *See S. Anſtin. l. 1. de Bapt. c. 3.*

g *Suteliſ. reſponſ. ad ſupplic. Cathol. c. 9.*

4. And if L. D. did wel conſider, that to devide any thing in

Points to be conſidered of L. D.

any

any of its ſubſtantial parts, were not to reform or purge it, but to deſtroy it, as to devide a horſe in his ſoule or bodie, it not to purge him, but to kill him, he would never ſay or think, that the Rom. Church, which both he and Proteſtants generally confeſs, *is a true Church of God in Subſtance*, either hath given, or can give Proteſtants juſt cauſe to devide her in any ſubſtantial Part of a Church becauſe as I ſaid, this is in effect to ſay, that a true Church of God in ſubſtance, can give juſt cauſe to deſtroy her ſelf, either wholy or in part. And it implieth contradiction, that a true Church of God ſhould give juſt cauſe to deſtroy her ſelf, either wholy or in part, or that there can be any juſt cauſe to deſtroy a true Church of God, either wholy or in part, wherefore when he

No juſt cauſe to deſtroy a true Church in ſubſtance.

he goeth about to prove, that the Rom. Church (which he confeſſeth to be a Catholike and true Church in ſubſtance) hath given juſt cauſe to Proteſtants to forſake her in any ſubſtantial part, he ſhold firſt prove, that a true Church in ſubſtance can give juſt cauſe of ſuch diviſion, and not either ignorantly or ſophiſtically ſuppoſe it, and therein commit that fallacie called *Petitio principii*. Proteſtants, who denie, that the Roman Church is a true Church in ſubſtance, may without contradiction ſay, ſhe hath given them juſt cauſe of ſeparating from her in ſome ſubſtantial part; but thoſewho grant her to be a true Church in ſubſtance, cannot without contradiction denie, that they are ſchiſmatiks, or ſay, that ſhe hath given, or can give them, juſt cauſe of ſuch diviſion from her. Likewiſe, if

L. D. ſuppoſeth, what he ſhould firſt prove.

L. D.

L. D. did wel consider, that there are three substantial parts of a true Church in substance, *Profession of all Christs faith, clearly taught by him, and sufficiently proposed to her, Communion in his Sacraments, and publike worship of God, and lawful Ministery*, as is evident by the definition of the true Church given both by Catholiks and Protestant, & proved by h me, he would never say, either that a true Church in substance, can give just cause to be devided in profession of faith, or in Communion of Sacraments, or lawfull Ministerie, because all division of a thing in any substantial part thereof, is a true destruction of it, as the division of a horse in his soul or bodie, is a true killing of him. And Protestants, having left the substance of a true Church in substance, can

h L. 1. *de Authore Protestant. c. 8. l. 2. de fund. & non fund. c. 12.*

can have nothing, but some accident, or rather some shadow of a true Church. Nether would he say, that Churches devided either in profession of faith, or in Communion of Sacraments, or in lawfull Ministery are the same Church in substance, as he sayeth the Roman and Protestant church, yea, the Grecian, Armenian, and Ethiopian churches are: which are evidently devided in all those substantiall parts; because, division in any substantial part, and much more in so many, is a division in substance, or substantial division of the thing.

Protestants can have but shadow of a true Church.

It also L. D. did consider, that any division of a true Church in any substantial parte of her, is truly impious, because it is a destruction of Christs mistical body, and division of his kingdome, he would denie as well,

well, that there can be juſt cauſe of ſuch diviſion of a Church, as he once denieth (*c.6. p.* 101.) that there can be juſt cauſe of true ſchiſm; becauſe ſuch diviſion of a true Church is true ſchiſm, and to grant that, and denie this, is to grant the definition, but denie the definite, as to grant one to be a rationall creature, and denie him to be a man. For, what ſin can an impious diviſion of a true Church be, but ſchiſm, and all diviſion in the ſubſtance, is impious, becauſe the ſubſtance of a Church true in ſubſtance is a ſacred ſociety inſtituted by God for the ſalvation of mankind, and to deſtroy the ſubſtance of ſuch a ſociety by diviſion in all, or any of her ſubſtantiall parts, is impious, and indeed damnable ſchiſm. And if L.D. well conſider all theſe, he will clearly ſee, that

All diviſion of a true Church in ſubſtance is impious ſchiſm.

that in confeſſing the Rom. Church to be a catholike and true Church in ſubſtance, he muſt needs alſo confeſs, that his Engliſh Proteſtant Church, in dividing her ſelf from the ſubſtance of the Roman in all her formal ſubſtantial parts, namely in her profeſſion of faith, in her communion of Sacraments, and her Miniſtery, committed impious and damnable ſin, and that he in defending her in that, defendeth impious and damnable ſin. God open his eyes to ſee this truth, and theirs alſo who ignorantly follow him.

What L.D. ſuppoſeth.

And this Preface alone may ſerve for a ful refutation of his book. For, his book ſuppoſeth, that a true Church in ſubſtance can give juſt cauſe to divide from her ſubſtance; or that diviſion from ſome ſubſtantiall part of a Church, is not a diviſion from her ſubſtance, or that profeſſion of

all

all Christs faith clearly taught by him, and sufficiently proposed to her, and communion in his Sacraments under his lawfull Officers, be not of the substance of the true Church. All which are evidently false, and to suppose them without all proof, is plain Sophistrie, and plain delusion of the Reader. If he will deal solidly and scholar-like, having granted, that the Roman Church is a catholike and *true Church in substance*, he must first prove, that a true Church in substance can give just cause and necessary to salvation, to depart from her substance; or that her profession of Faith, her communion in Sacraments, her Ministerie, are not

What L. D. must do to clear Protestants from schism. *L. D. p. 17.*

Aug. l. 2. cont. Parm. c. 11. Præscindendæ unitatis nulla est justa necessitas.

not of her ſubſtance, or that to depart from ſome or all ſubſtantiall parts of a thing is not to depart from its ſubſtance, or he muſt grant that the Proteſtant Church is departed from the ſubſtance of a Catholike & true Church without juſt cauſe, and ſo is true Schiſmatick.

Secondly, he muſt prove, that his Proteſtant Church had juſt cauſe to depart from all theſe, *the Pope, the Papacie, the Roman Church, and alſo from all ancient Chriſtian Churches,* in their communion of Sacraments, beeauſe the Proteſtant Churches departed from all theſe; and alſo, that ſhe hath juſt cauſe to joyn in communion of Sacraments and publike prayers, with ſuch as he counteth Schiſmaticks, as are Puritans and Independents, be[illegible] to communicate with Schiſm[illegible]s is to be guilty of ſchiſm.

Thirdly, he must prove, not only that the present Protestants have just cause to abide out of the Roman Church, but also, that Luther and the first Protestants had just and necessary cause to go first out of her communion. For otherwise, the present Protestants will *appear to be heirs and successors of true Schismaticks*, as S. Optate objected to the Donatists of his time.

Give us a *a just cause*, and *b necessary to salvation*, why Protestants first went, and now continue out of the Communion in Sacraments of the Roman Church, which you confess to be a *catholike Church*, *and a true Church in substance*, or *da gloria* [illegible], and confess Protestants to [illegible] Schismaticks. Cannot sa[illegible] be had in a *catholike Church*,

a L.D.p.10.27. 28.110.107.
b p.279.p.246.8. 24. p. 29.159. 155.

Church, and a true Church in substance? Must men needs destroy a part of a *catholike and true Church in substance*, (as they do, who leave her communion in Sacraments) to obtain salvation? Cannot salvation be had, but by a sacrilegious destruction in part, of the Spouse of Christ, his mysticall body and his Kingdome? or can a *catholike and true Church in substance* teach heresies or errors in faith, which are opposite to verities fundamentall and necessary to salvation? No, no: There can be no just cause, & much less a cause necessary to salvation, to alter either the profession of faith, communion in Sacraments, or Ministerie of a catholike and true Church in substance, because those are her substantial parts, and one substantial part being changed and destroyed, she is substantially changed and destroyed. To conclude,

in a word, it implies contradiction to grant the Roman Church to be a catholike and true Church in ſubſtance, and to denie Proteſtants to be true Schiſmaticks. For every diviſion or rupture of a catholike and true Church in her ſubſtance, is impious ſchiſm, becauſe it is a deſtruction of her in part. And Proteſtants have divided the Roman Church in all her ſubſtantial parts.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE *Lord of Derries*

First Chapter of his Book of Schism, wherein he propoſeth the ſcope and ſum of his Treatiſe.

THe Lord of Derrie, in the very beginning of his book of ſchiſm, ſaith, that nothing hitherto hath been, or can be hereafter more colourably objected to the Proteſtant Church of England, then the crime of ſchiſm, which whether he ſaith, to ſhew his ability or courage to defend their Church from that crime, which with moſt colour can bee objected to her,

and from which, no other Engliſh Miniſter (for ought I know) hath hitherto dared to defend her in any eſpecial Treatiſe, I will not inquire. But he telleth not, why the objection of Schiſm ſeemeth more forcible againſt their Church, then the objection of hereſie. The true reaſon whereof is, becauſe the matter of hereſie is a matter of doctrine, which kinde of matter is not evident as that of mere ſchiſm, which is a viſible matter of fact, namely, a viſible ſeparation or diviſion in communion of Sacraments and publike worſhip of God. And ſeeing it is viſible (and [a] Proteſtants themſelves confeſs) that have ſo ſeparated themſelves, not only from the

Why harder to clear Proteſt. from Schiſm, then from hereſie.

a *Calvin. Epiſt.* 141. *Chilling. c.* 3 ſee more *l. de Author. Proteſt.* 2. *c.* 3. and *li. ur.* 2. *c.* 9.

the Roman, but also from all other Christian Churches in the world, no marvel if it seem a hard task for any Minister to cleare their CHURCH from schism, seeing themselves *b* teach, that no cause but necessity of salvation can justifie separation in communion of Sacraments & the publike worship of God, from the crime of Schism. And it must needs seem hard to prove that it was, or yet is necessary for salvation of Protestants, to make or continue a separation in communion of Sacraments, & publike worship of God, from all Christian Churches whatsoever. As if when Protestants began their separation, there had been then no Christian Church in the world, in

b *Calvin. 4. Instit. c. 1. Sect. 12. Daile Epist. ad Mongl. Potter. sec. 3 p. 73. & sec. 2. p. 43. Chillingworth c. 8. laude sec. 26. p. 196.*

whose communion they could have obtain'd salvation. For hence it will follow, that at that time there was no true Church of God on earth. For surely, if there was no Church, in which men might gain salvation, there was then no true Church of God. Wherfore L. Derrie undertaking to clear the Protestant Church from schism, either only or especially concerning her separation from the Pope or Roman Church, he undertakes but in part to justifie it: Because when she separated from the Pope or Rom. Church in communion of Sacraments and publike worship, she separated also from all Christian Churches in the world in the same communion, as from the Grecian, Armenian, Ethiopian, &c. & still continueth her division from them, as well as from the Pope and Roman Church. So that though L. Derrie had cleared the Protestant Church from schism, touching her

separation from the Pope and Roman Church in communion of Sacraments and publike worship of God, yet he had not sufficiently cleared her from schism; for her separation from all other antient Christian Churches in the like communion. Moreover, he professeth onely to cleare the Protestant Church of England from the crime of schism, as if either other Protestant Churches were guilty of schism, or it were too hard for him to defend them from it. Surely, this seems either to argue his little charity towards other Protestant Churches, or his little skil to defend them.

If Protestants communicate with Schismaticks, they become Schismaticks.

But unless all Churches, with which the English Protestant Church communicates, be cleared from schism, the Protestant Church of England is not cleared, because she communicates in Sacraments and publike

worship of God with Schismaticks, and who communicates with any schismaticall Church in Sacraments & publike worship of God, are guilty of schism, for such communicating is a reall approbation of their schism.

Three faults in L. Derries purpose.

Three faults therefore I note in the L. Derries intention or designe. First, that he purposeth to cleare the English Protestant Church from schism, and not all Protestant Churches, or at least all with which the English communicates in Sacraments and publike worship of God, because to communicate in Sacraments with any Schismaticks, is to be guilty of their schism. The second is, that he intends to clear the English Protestant Church from schism, onely con-

concerning her separation from the Pope and the Roman Church, seeing some may judge her schismaticall, for her separation from all other Christian Churches, though she were not for her separation from the Pope and Roman Church. His third fault is, that he principally indeavoureth to justifie his English Protestant Churches separation from the Roman Church, for the * personall faults of Popes & Court of Rome, without proving, that the Roman Church approved or could remedie their faults without greater mischief, and so would justifie separation from the Roman Church, not for her fault, but for the faults of others. So did the schismaticall Donatists indeavour to justifie their separation from the universall Church, for the pre-

* *C. 6. sect. 129, 130, 131, 137. & seqq.*

tended

tended faults of Cæcilianus, Biſhop of Carthage, whereas he knowes that *c* Proteſtants confeſs, that it is not lawful to ſeparate communion *ob malos mores*, and if it were, in what Proteſtant Church could he live, and that when he hath ſaid all the worſt he can of Popes, he cannot ſay worſe then could be ſaid of Annas & Caiphas, and yet neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles ſeparated themſelves from their communion, ſo long as the ſynagogue ſtood; nor worſe then could be ſaid of Judas, whom Chriſt called a *Devil*, and and S. John (ch. 6. 10.) a *thief*, for ſtealing what was given to Chriſt, and whom at laſt he betrayed for money: and nevertheleſs to have ſeparated

c Confeſſ. Auguſt. ar. 20. Argentin. c. 23 Gallice art. 27.

No Popes worſe then Caiphas.

Nor then Judas.

separated from his communion in Sacraments, was to commit damnable schism; and Christ and his Apostles communicated with him till the last.

Upon His Second Chapter.

IN his second chapter L. D. to state the question, whether the English Protestant Church be guilty of schism, declares what schism is, and what he meanes by Protestant Church of England. *Schisme* (he saith p. 114.) *is a criminous scissure, rent, or division in the Church, an Ecclesiasticall seditious*

First fault of L. D. definition of schism.

lik

like to a mutinie in an army, or a faction in a ſtate. In which definition one great fault is, that he expreſſeth not in what kind of things this ſciſſure or diviſion of the Church is, whether only in ſome ſubſtantiall part of the Church, or alſo in ſome accident thereof, and ſo the definition is not clear, which is a great fault in a definition. For the Church may criminouſly be divided either in ſome thing, which is ſubſtantial to her, or which is onely accidental. But it ſeems he means, either ſubſtantial or accidental, becauſe he adds, that the Church may be *ſchiſmatically rent, either in her internal communion, or external communion*, and internal communion is accidental to her, which is untrue. For neither is ſchiſm a diviſion in any thing which is accidental to the Church, for ſo diviſion in Eccleſiaſtical ceremonies,

monies, or ſcholaſtical opinions, ſhould be ſchiſm, but onely is a diviſion in ſomething, which is eſſential or ſubſtantial to the Church, as is profeſſion of faith, communion in Sacraments, and lawful Miniſterie.

Now all theſe, and onely theſe three, are ſubſtantial parts of the Church, as is evident by the definitions of her, given by Catholikes and *b* Proteſtants. And diviſion in profeſſion of faith, is called by a peculiar name, *hereſie*, becauſe profeſſion of faith is a more peculiar and principal part of the Church, then is either communion of Sacraments, or lawfull Miniſters. For without actual true faith none can be ſaved, or eſteemed of the

a *Staplet. Conſ.* 1 *q* 5. *a.* 1. *Bellar. l.* 3. *de Eu. c.* 2. *Perron in Repl. a* 8.

b *See l.* 2. *de Authore Proteſt. c.* 6. *&* 8.

the Church, but one may be both ſaved and held of the Church, though he actually communicate not in Sacraments, nor obey lawfull Paſtors, if he be with-held by force. Beſides, *hereſie* [c] denieth God to be true in all his words, which ſimple ſchiſm doth not. And therfore diviſion in communion in Sacraments, and rebellion to lawful Paſtors, is called by the common name *ſchiſm*, or *mere ſchiſm*. And this is that crime whereof we ſpeak, when we impute ſchiſm (and not hereſie) to Proteſtants, and of which alone L. D. ſhould ſpeak in this Treatiſe; but he oftentimes confoundeth mere ſchiſm, with ſchiſm in general, as it comprehendeth alſo hereſie; and to juſtifie the diviſion of Proteſtants from the Roman Church in communion of Sacraments,

c See l. 2. of fundam. & non fundam. c. 8.

and lawful Ministerie, bringeth in the question of matters of faith, which were only to justifie their division from the Roman Church, from heresie; and is to confound the question of mere schism, (of which alone hee pretendeth to treat) with the question of schism in generall, as it comprehendeth also heresie. Which questions, as they are different, so they ought to be differently handled; and some may be mere schismaticks, and not hereticks, as were in the Synagogue Core, Dathan, and Abyron; and in the Church, the Luciferians and Meletians, and (for some time) also the Donatists, who (as S. Austin saith) for a time did *wrangle onely about communion in Sacraments*, and not about any point of faith.

Wherefore

Wherefore, to clear Protestants from their schism, it sufficeth not to bring in any matters of faith, because true schism may be, where is no division in faith, as it was in Core, Dathan, and Abiron, in the Luciferians, Meletians, and Donatists. And the reason is, because there may be division from communion in Sacraments and lawful Pastors, without division in profession of faith, and that division is as wel damnable, as this is, because (as is evident) it tendeth to the destruction of the whole Church, whose essence consisteth in the union of all her essential parts, and her destruction in the division of them; and also it actually destroyeth that part of the Church, which is so divided. Wherefore

Schism tendeth to the destruction of the Church, and in part destroyeth it.

pag.

pag. 22. he giveth a somwhat better definition, saying, *Mere schism is a culpable rupture or breach of the Catholike communion*, to which pag. seq. he addeth, *without sufficient ground*, and should have added also, *in Sacraments, or lawful Ministerie*; for to shew, that schism is a rupture of the Church in some substantial part of her: and should also have told, what is a sufficient ground, which he hath not done. But indeed there can be no sufficient ground of schism, or of rending a true Church in any of her substantial parts. For such rending or division is in part a destruction of the Church. And there can be no just ground in any destruction of the Church of God, as is evident.

2. Another great fault of L. Derries is, that pag. 15. he requireth internal communion in faith, in charity,

charitie,& good opinion of others, to avoid schism. For,albeit internal communion in faith, charity, &c. be required to the perfection of the Church, yet it is not necessary to her substance, as is evident, because they neither are put in the definition of the Church, nor being invisible, can be of the substance of the Church, which is a visible societie in profession of Christs faith, communion in his Sacraments, under Pastoral authoritie to administer his Word and Sacraments. And therefore division in them, can be no true schism, because schism is a division in some substantiall part of the Church, what other sin soever division in them be, to wit Infidelity, or want of charity. Wherefore when L. D. saith *This internal communion is of absolute necessitie among all Catholicks*, if he mean of absolute neces-

necessity to be saved, hee speaketh truth, but not to the purpose, because we speak not of what is necessary to salvation, but only what is necessary to be no schismatick; and if hee mean of absolute necessity to be a Catholick, and not schismatick, hee speaks untruly. For it is of no necessity at all to be a Catholick, or no schismatick, but only it is necessary to be a good Catholick; and a bad Catholick may be no schismatick.

3. Externall communion L. D. saith p. 15, consists first in the same Creeds or Symbols or confessions of faith. 2. In the participation of the same Sacraments. 3. In the same externall worship. 4. In the use of the same Rites or ceremonies. 5. In communicatory letters from one Church to another. And lastly, in admission of the same discipline and subjection to the same Eccle-

Eccleſiaſtical authority, that is, Epiſcopacie, or a general Council, which is an Aſſembly of Paſtors. For the firſt point of theſe, here is that fault I touched before, to wit, that communion in faith is pretended a ſufficient excuſe from true ſchiſm. And another, that communion in the ſame Creeds or Symbols, meaning (as he doth) in the Apoſtles, Nicene or Athanaſius Creeds, is ſufficient to excuſe from breach in true ſaving faith. For (as I have ſhewed * other-where at large) true ſaving faith requireth communion in faith of all Gods words clearly revealed by him, and ſufficiently propoſed to us. The ſecond point alſo is untrue: for external Catholike communion conſiſteth not in the participation of the ſame Sacraments (for mere

* *L. 2. de diſtinc. fund. & non fund. c. 4, 5.*

Schiſ.

Schismaticks participate all the same Sacraments which Catholikes do) but in participating the same Sacraments with Catholikes. As to dine or sup with one, is not sufficient that he eat the same meat which another doth, but he must also eat it with him. And in like sort the third point is untrue: for externall communion doth not consist in the same extenral worship, but in doing it with Catholikes, as appeareth in Core, Lucifer, and Meletius.

Communion requireth more then participation of the same Sacraments.

The fourth point is likewise untrue. For externall Ecclesiasticall communion doth not require the same publike rites or ceremonies, because these are but accidents to the Church, without union wherein, the substantial union of the Church may wel stand. And as for the

the fift, communion of Churches doth not conſiſt in communicatory letters one from the other, onely that ſheweth their communion. And as for the laſt point, true communion Eccleſiaſtical requireth admiſſion and ſubjection to Epiſcopacie, becauſe that is a ſubſtantiall part of the true Church, but how that will ſtand with the allowance of communion with Puritans, and Independents in England and Scotland, or French Huguenots, I ſee not.

By this it is evident, that L. D. holdeth his Proteſtant Engliſh Church eſſentially different from Puritans, and Independents, and and alſo Scottiſh and French Huguenots, becauſe they reject ſuch Epiſcopacie, as L. D. requireth eſſentially, to Catholicks, and alſo, that he condemneth them of true ſchiſm, becauſe they neither admit,

nor

nor subject themselves to such Episcopacy as he essentially requireth to a Catholike. And hence will follow, that the English Protestant Church is schismatical, by communicating with Puritans, Independents, and Scottish and French Huguenots, who are true Schismaticks, because they reject Episcopacie (which even in L.D. judgment) is an essentiall part of a true Church, and to reject any essentiall part of the Church is true schism.

4. Wherefore seeing L.D. hath failed so many wayes in defining schism, and what is necessary to true schism, let us define it better, & thus. *True schism is a voluntary division in some substantiall part of the true Church.* And as there are three

What is true schism.
Ignorance of the definition root of errors.
Clem. Alex. l. 8. Strom.

ſubſtantiall parts thereof, namely, *Profeſſion of faith*, *communion in Sacraments*, *and lawfull Miniſterie*: ſo there may be true and damnable diviſion from any of theſe parts, though (as I ſaid) diviſion in *profeſſion of faith* be both true ſchiſm & hereſie alſo, I ſay, *voluntary*, that I may diſtinguiſh *ſchiſm* from *excommunication*, which of its nature is an unvoluntary diviſion, and not a ſin (as ſchiſm is) but a puniſhment of ſin. I ſay alſo, *diviſion of the true Church*, becauſe diviſion from a falſe Church, in one, or all her ſubſtantial parts, is no ſchiſm or ſin. I ſay alſo, *in ſome ſubſtantiall part*, to diſtinguiſh ſchiſm from diviſion in ceremonies, or opinions, which are beſides faith, or ſuch things, as are not ſubſtantial to the true Church. I add alſo, that as the Church is divided into univerſal or particular, or into the whole, or

part

part of the Church, so there may be either an universal schism, that is, division from the whole Church in some substantial Part of her, or a particular schism, that is, a division from some particular Church in some of her substantial parts. And an universal schism is alwayes wicked, because the *e* universall true Church can give no just cause of any substantial division from her, as we have proved at at large *f* otherwhere; neither can there be salvation with voluntary separation from her, because out of her there is no salvation, as even L.D. confesseth *infra*, *c.9.p.*245. and there can be no just cause to leave salvation: Neither indeed can there be any substantial division

e *August. Epist.* 48. *l.*2. *cont. Parm. c.*11. *l.*3 1.4.

f Of the sufficient Propoſer of faith, l.1. c.4. & seqq.

from any particular Church, unleſs ſhe be really heritical or ſchiſmatical. I ſay *really*, becauſe ſhe may be really heretical or ſchiſmatical, and yet morally a true particular Church, becauſe ſhe is invincibly ignorant of her Hereſie and Schiſm, and ſo may require profeſſion of her Hereſie, as a condition of communicating with her. In which caſe, diviſion from her, is no ſchiſm or ſin, but vertue, and neceſſarie. But all rent of any true real Church, in any ſubſtantial part of her, is true and damnable Schiſm, neither can there be any juſt cauſe of ſuch rent. Becauſe as I ſaid, all ſuch rent is in part a deſtruction of the Church, and there cannot be any juſt cauſe of any deſtruction of the true Church of God.

No juſt cauſe of renting a true real Church, in any of her ſubſtantial parts.

5. What

5. What L. D. saith pag. 18. that the British Churches were never judged schismatical, because they differed from the rest of the West, about the observation of Easter, is partly true, if he mean precisely of the observation it self, because that was in it self no point of faith, nor substantial to the Church; but is untrue if he mean it of the Britains manner of observing Easter, or their obstinacie in their error. For they held, that it was needful to observe Easter, as they did, and unlawful, to observe as catholiks did, which is schismatical, and therefore were judged Schismatiks, both by Catholiks of that time and since, and also by Protestants, as I have shewed *l.* 1. *Florum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, c.* 9. What he saith pag 19. *of leaving a house infected with the plague, with a purpose to return to it, when it is cleansed*, may be true of a

Particular Church, because that may be invincibly infected with heresie or schism, but can not be admitted of the Vniversal, because she is, *columna & firmamentum veritatis* 1 Tim. 3.) out of which there is no salvation. Now Protestants left the universal Church in her communion of Sacraments as is evident, and themselves confess. *See before c. 1. n. 1. and. infra c. 9.*

6. After this p. 23. he tells us, *the Catholick Church is neither the Church of Rome nor Africk, but the whole Church of Christ throughout the world*, which he proveth, because the African Catholicks in their conference with Donatists, said, *We are joyned in communion with the whole Christian world. This is the Church, we have chosen to maintain.* True it is, neither the Church of the city of Rome, nor of Africk, is the catholick Church, because *the*

Church

Church signifieth the whole Church of Christ; But not such a whole Church as L. D. meaneth, to wit, the multitude or rather multitudes of all Christians throughout the world, who agree in the fundamental points of faith, (which yet is but a mere shift) howsoever they differ in other points of faith, and wholly in communion of Sacraments, and Government of the Church. Such a multitude we denie to be the Church of Christ, as never instituted by him, or approved by the fathers, but a mass of monsters, a Hydra of many heads. The catholick Church, which the African catholicks maintained, was wholy one in Profession of faith, communion of Sacraments and lawful Ministerie, and they

Christ never instituted a Church consisting of catholicks, heretikes, and schismaticks.

wholly communicated with it in all its substantial parts, whereas L. D. his catholike Church is pretended to be one, onely in fundamentals, not professing to communicate with her in any other thing, which is to be Christs Church in a small part, and simply to be not his Church: nor to communicate simply with her, but rather, not to communicate with her.

7. Pag. 24. L. D. saith, that *the Church of Rome is called a catholike Church, and the Bishop of Rome a catholike Bishop.* And pag. 29. *that he maketh not the least doubt in the world, that the Church of England before the* (Protestant) *reformation, and the Church of England after the reformation, are as much the same Church, as a garden after it is weeded*: Which I see not how they can stand together; For as he saith pag. 24. *the catholike Church is totum homogeneum*;

mogeneum; but the Church of Rome is not homogeneal with a Protestant, because they differ in all the essential parts of the Church, to wit, *in professione fidei, communione Sacramentorum, & Ministris*, and also because as L.D. saith, p. 25. & 147. the Roman Church is idolatrous in her adoration of the Sacrament. And surely an idolatrous Church differeth essentially from a true Church of Christ. The proe, the poup, the life of the soul, the sum, the definition of a Protestant, is to believe justification only by special faith, as I have shewed l. 1 of *the Author of the Protestant Religion*, c. 6. which kind of belief the Roman Church condemneth, as I have shewed in *The Protestants plain Confession*, c. 5. And can they be one substantial

What is the life and soul of a Protestant.

Church, who condemn the life and soul of the other. Besides, they are divided in communion of Sacraments, neither receiving Sacraments with the other, and also in Ministers, because power to offer sacrifice is essential to Ministers of the Roman Church, which power Protestants condemn.

8. Pag. 26. he telleth us, that one may be guilty of heresie many wayes. 1. By disbelieving any fundamental article in that sense wherein it was ever believed by the universal Church. 2. By believing some error, which, by evident consequence, subverteth some fundamental article: Yet because that consequence may seem evident to one, which doth not to another, he wisheth men to be sparing in censuring heretikes for consequences. 3. By maintaining lesser errors with obstinate opposition

to lawful determination. For though no Council can make that fundamental, or heretical, which was not so ever, yet it can bind us to silence. Thus he, wherein are divers things amisse.

First, that Heresie is not incurred but by disbelieving of some fundamental point of faith, or by believing something which by necessary consequence subverteth some fundamental point of faith. For (as I have shewed l. 2. fund. and not fundam. cap. 2.) Heresie is incurred by disbelieving any point of faith whatsoever, if it be sufficiently proposed. And is not incurred, by not believing some consequences, as we shall see anon: only I like well, that he would not have men to be easily censured as Hereticks, for matters of consequence: Which if he would observe, he would not censure Papists for Hereticks, because they believe

not Protestants cõsequences (which they infer against them) to be necessary: as the Eucharist is a commemoration of Christ; therefore not Christ himself, & such like. 2. That he saith, no councel can make that a point of faith or heresie, which was not ever such; For though no counsel can make that divine revealed truth, which is not such, yet it can make us know and believe that to be divine truth, which we knew not before, and in that sense make it a point of faith, which was not before. Because two things are necessary to a point of faith, divine revelations, and sufficient proposal. And without both (in ordinary course) we cannot believe with devine faith. As the Apostle saith, *how shall they believe without a preacher?* 3. In that he saith, all Christians ought to be silent in what is defined by a lawful general counsel, though they cannot assent to

it in their judgment, doth bind men to be hypocrites, and dissemblers in matters of religion, and by their silence to suppress or bury devine truth. But to this absurdity Protestants are brought; by their denial of the Churches infallibilitie in matters of faith, For if she define an error, and they profess it, they sin against conscience, and deny their faith: If they be silent, they betray divine truth, especially if they be Ministers of the Word, and incur that *Ve mihi si non evangelizavero.* 1 Cor. 9.

9. Lastly, pag. 30. he telleth, what he understandeth by the Church of England, which he will defend from schism, to wit, *That Church, which was derived by lineal succession from the the British, English, and Scotish Bishops, by mixt ordination as it was legally established in the days of K. Edward 6. and flourished in the reign of Q. Elizabeth K. James.*

Protestant Church first established by a child.

and King Charles. And (which he should have added) suppressed by the last Parliament under him, *and now groans under the heavy yoak of persecution.* In which words he professeth to defend from schism not all Protestant Churches, but one only, to wit, that which was established by the authority of Edward the sixth a child, and flourished under Q. Elisabeth, K. James, and K. Charles, but suppressed also under him. 2. He professeth to defend a Protestant Church, which was derived by lineal succession from the British, English, and Scotish Bishops: which is a mere imaginary Church, not proved at all. For to omit all other differences, what British, English, or Scotish Bishops, ever taught justification by only special faith, which is *the life, soul, and sum of the Protestant Church?* What mixt ordination had the first Protestant Bishops under Q. Elisabeth? but of this we shall speak more hereafter.

after. Or what meaneth he by a *mixt ordination*, but partly Papiſtical, partly Proteſtantial, as Maſon ſaid, partly a roſe, partly a thiſtle? How was that religion legally eſtabliſhed in K. Edwards time which was eſtabliſhed contrary to the liking of moſt of the true Piſhops of that time? How was the catholick Church and religion legally condemned, which then was never heard to defend her ſelf? How doth that Church groan under the heavy yoak of perſecution, which conformeth it ſelf in all things to that religion, which is ſaid to perſecute it, and for which never a Biſhop or Miniſter there yet, hath ſuffered death, or impriſonment for defending it. Some of them have loſt their livings, but not for defending Proteſtant religion, but for ſtate maters, and therefore their Church or religion groans not under the heavy yoak of perſecution, but only ſome men who were once of that religion, groan under affliction for

matter of state. Your English Protestant Church is quite dead. Because all your Protestant Ministers & people in England as I am told, joyn themselves in communion of Sacraments, and publick worship of God with Puritans, Independents, such as you account true Schismaticks. And by that association, become Schismaticks, though they had been not such, for their separation from the Roman Church in communion of Sacraments; and so the Protestant English Church is become double schismatical, first for her separation from the catholick Church in communion of Sacraments; and 2. for her association to cōmunion in Sacraments of schismatical Churches. For the guilt of schism, is as well contracted by association to Schismaticks, as by division from Catholicks. And no doubt L. D. would say, that the Popish Church in England were dead, if every Popish

Protestant English Church quite dead.

Priest and Papist in England did go to Church now in England. Not only Core, & such as separated themselves from Moyses, but even all who adjoyned themselves to Core, were true Schismaticks; and a schismaticall Church, whether by division from Catholikes, or association to Schismatikes, is a dead Church, and no more a true Church, then a dead body is a true man, because it hath lost an essentiall part of a true Church, to wit, communion in Sacraments, and publike worship of God, with the true Church.

10. Wherfore to sum up all (as L. D. doth, pag. 27.) which hath been said of the second chapter, it appeareth that the L.D. hath failed in defining what schism is, in not expressing in what any rupture of the Church is schism, to wit, in some substantial part of her, as in profession of faith, in communion of Sacraments, in lawful

Which is the reall Catholike Church.

Miniſterie. 2. He hath failed in defining what the catholike Church is, to wit, a multitude really ſpread all the world over, and really one, or united, or undivided in all ſubſtantial parts of a Church, as in profeſſion of faith, communion of Sacraments, and lawful Miniſterie. And not (as L. D. thinketh) a multitude (or rather multitudes) ſpread over the world, but divided in all, or ſome ſubſtantial parts of a Church, as in profeſſion of faith, communion of Sacraments, or lawful Miniſterie. For as S. Auſtin (the chief of the aforeſaid African Catholikes) ſaith, *Catholikes are every where, and Heretikes every where, but Catholikes are the ſame every where, and Heretikes different every where.*

L. 4. cont. Creſcon. c. 61.

3. Thirdly, he hath failed in defining an heretike, to be one, who denieth ſome fundamental article,

cle, or some evident & necessary consequence from such article. For they are as wel heretikes who deny not fundamental, that is, not principal points of faith, as who deny fundamental, that is, principal points of faith, as if they be as sufficiently proposed to be revealed or taught of God, because Gods authority is as wel to the one, as to the other, and his authority is as wel denied in denying the one, as the other. For it is not so much the matter which is to be believed, as the authority of the revealer, which bindeth us to believe, and that being equally to both kinds of articles, principal or secondary, it bindeth us equally to believe both, and it is equally infidelity to d sbelieve either, as I clearly proved in the Treatise of *fundamental and not fundamental points*, l. 2. c. 2, 3 4. Likewise he faileth in defining him to be an heretike, who assenteth not to an evident

Faith is not for consequences.

and necessarie consequence out of a matter of faith. For, as faith assenteth only for authority, as is evident by the Apostles, *Faith is of hearing*, Rom. 10. and *S. Austin, *That we believe, we owe to authority, that we know to reason*, and that both Catholicks & Protestants define faith to be *an assent to divine revelations, upon the authority of the revealer*, as I have shewed, l. 1. of the *Alsufficient Proposer* c. 2. As (I say) faith is an assent only for authority; so heresie (which is formerly opposite to faith) is dissent only to authority: and as faith is not gotten by consequences, but only theological science, or opinion, so neither is faith lost, nor heresie incurred by denying any consequence, but only by denying authority. And to say the contrary, is to be ignorant of the nature of faith,

* *De util. cred. Melanthon in prædic. qualitatis Laude Relat. Sect. 28. Potter sec. 5. Chilling. c. 1. p 35.*

Faith is neither got nor lost by consequences.

faith, and to confound assent of faith, with assent of science or opinion. 4. He hath failed many ways in defining his English Protestant Church, as appeareth by what is said already, and shall also hereafter. 5. In deriving it by lineal succession from the British, English, and Scotish, from which Churches, he hath no succession, neither in profession of faith, nor in communion of Sacraments, nor in lawful ministery. Again, in saying that it was legally established in K. Edwards time, when it was set up contrary to the sentence of the most and best Bishops, whereof divers were cast in prison, for not assenting to the erecting it. Besides, it was legally suppressed in Q. Maries days, and L. D. doth not shew that it was legally re-established by Q. Elisabeth. Then that he saith it groaneth under persecution in England, where indeed it is dead. And if of late, some Protestants are revived, and abstain from communion with

Schismaticks, they are so few as (that as Optate said l. 2. of some Donatists) they deserve not the name of a Church, and much less, of a Church, of a Nation.

A brief Survey of L. Derries *third Chapter.*

1. IN the third Chapter pag. 31. L.D. avoucheth, *That it is undeniably true, that the secession or substraction of obedience (from the Pope) was not made by our Reformers, or by any of their friends or favourers, but by the zelots of the Roman Religion.* This he proveth, *Because both the* * *Universities decreed thus: The Pope hath no more jurisdiction in England, then any other strange Prince. And the same was voted, and decreed in our National Synods, and lastly established in full Parliament, with the approbation of 24. Bishops, and 29. Abbots. That the King as head of the body politike consisting of the Spiritualty and Temporalty hath plenary power to render finall justice for all matters.* And then asketh, *What is become now of the great exception against Protestants*

* See Twin l. 3. Sect. 223.

stants, for making the King the head of the English Church?

2. To this I answer; 1. That those who made the K. head of the Church, were so far from being *zelots of the Roman Reilgion*, as they were not then of the Roman Religion at all, seeing (as † Protestants teach) the essence of the Roman religion consisteth in the Primacie of the Pope, and in denying that, they were not only schismaticks, but also heretikes outwardly, whatsoever they believed inwardly. Besides, as B. Gardiner in Fox Act. p. 1349. saith, *The Parlement was with much cruelty constrained to abolish and put away the Primacy from the B. of Rome.* And p. 1344. *When the tumult was in the North, I am sure the K. was determined to have given over the supremacy to the Pope. After this M. Knevet and I were sent Ambassadors to the Emperor, to desire him, that he would be a means between the Popes Holinesse and the King to bring the King to the obedience of the See of Rome.* 2. I say, that the first Author of this secession from the Popes authority, was Cranmer.

† *L. 1. Florum Eccl. Ang. c. 20. Reynolds Confer. p. 568.*

See Sanders de schism. fol. 101. *Spondan. An.* 1541. *Goduin in vita Cranmeri. Copus Dial. 6. p. 730.*

mer, whom (I hope) L.D. wil not deny to have been a friend and favourer of Protestants For as Parker, Godwin in the lives of Arch-bishops, and all who write of that matter, testifie, it was he who first gave counsel, that the King should decline the Popes judgment in matter of his divorce, and seek the judgment of Universities, and follow that, *Non amplius Romanam Curiam petat*, as Parker reporteth his words, or as Godwin writeth, *Consultius esse duco, ut Romanæ Curiæ longùm valedicto, tum in nostris, cum aliis Europæ Academiis, doctissimi hac de re consulantur. Etsi illorum tum judicia secutus fuerit, non erit, cur, quid Romana curia de hac re statuat, multùm sanè posthac sit solicitus.* And upon this (as Fox saith p. 1689.) *by commission, it was disputed by the Divines in both Universities.* Behold! Cranmer the first author of secession from the Pope. And this L. D. seems to confesse, for p. 44. he saith, *The coals of the Kings suspition* (about his marriage) *were kindled in Spain, France, and Flanders, but it was Cranmer that struck the naile home.* And Wever in his Monuments p. 191. *It was generally conceived, and truly (as I think) that these politike wayes for taking away from the Pope his authority here in England, as also the suppression of Religious Houses, were principally devised by Cromwell.*

And

And was not Cromwel a fauorer of Protestants? Parker in vita Warhami, *Cranmur freed the Kings conscience from the yoke of Papal dominion.* Ibid 1 *By their* (Cranmer, Cromwel) *Counsel, punishment and destruction was provided divinely to the Court of Rome.* Et in vita Cranmeri: *The K. was divinely brought by Cranmers singular vertue, to defend the cause of the Gospel. Item by these laws* (1536.) *Papal power, which, had stood in England above 900 years, being discovered by K H. authoritie and Cranmers; easily, fel down.* And, as for the title of *head of the Church*, D. Barnes, (one of the Protestant Martyrs) being to die, did as *Fox* writeth, p. 1094. say *His grace is made a whole King, and obeyed in his realm as a King* (*which neither his Father, nor Grandfather, neither his ancestors, who reign-*

Protestants authors of the Head of the Church. See Parker invita Warami, and Wevers Monument p. 89.

ed before him, ever had) and that through the preaching of us (Protestants) *and such other wreches, as we are which alwaies have applied our whole studies, and given our selves to the setting forth of the same.* And what doth he mean by *a whole King*, and *such as none of his Ancestors were*, but *a Head of the Church*, and that, *through his and Protestants preaching*. How then is it true, which L. D. saith p. 53. *It is evident, that Protestants had no hand ether in the separation of the English Church from the Court of Rome, or in their separation from the Church of Rome?* Were not Barnes and his fellowes, Protestants, and was it not *through their preaching*, that King Henrie 8. was made a whole King, such as none of his predecessors were, that is, Head of all, and in all causes?

3. But be it so, that Roman Catholiks were the authors of the division of the English Church from the Romans

Vos esse hæredes Schismaticorum euidenter apparet. S. Optate l. 1

Roman, that is worse for Protestants; Because the protestants succeed, and continue not onely a wicked Schisme, but also most wickedly begun. For Roman Catholiks could not, but against their own conscience (impugning *agnitam veritatem*, and so sinning against the holie Ghost) separate themselves from the communion of the Roman Church. So that, Protestants are Successors and heirs in a wicked Schisme, and to most wicked authors thereof. And though Protestants had not been Schismatiks for their own separation from the Roman Church, they had, for their association and approbation of these Roman Catholiks, who against their own conscience separated themselves from it, because Schisme is contracted by association to Schismatiks, and allowance of their Schisme. And albeit

L. D. will not acknowledg K. Henrie 8 for a Proteſtant, yet Dr. Humfrey, *ad Rationem tertiam Campiani*, Dr. Fulk againſt Heskins and Sanders, acknowledg him *a member of the Catholick Church*, and Dr. Andrews c. 1. reſponſ. ad Apolog. Bellarmin; *for a true defender of the true faith*: and Dr. Bucer in his epiſtle dedicatorie of his Commentarie epiſto'æ ad Romanos, *for an embraſer of the pure Goſpel of Chriſt, rejecting deviſes of men contrary thereto*. Parker alſo ſupra n. 2. *He defended the cauſe of the Goſpel.* And though perhaps L. D. may denie him to be a perfect and entire Proteſtant, becauſe he denied not ſo many points of Catholik faith as vſually Proteſtants doe, yet he cannot denie him to have been a ſubſtantial Proteſtant, becauſe he denyed that, which is ſufficient to a Proteſtant, to wit, the Popes Supremacie

K. Henrie was a Proteſtant.

What is sufficient to a Protestant.

macie, and was a perfect Antipapist, which, in the judgment of learned Protestants, is sufficient to a substantial Protestant, as I shewed l. 1. *de Authore Protestantismi* c. 3. and if L. D. denie that to be sufficient to a substantial Protestant, I think he will be much troubled to set downe, what is sufficient thereto, and not to reject or accept men for Protestants, as he pleaseth.

Catholiks suffer for religion.

4. What L. D. sayeth p. 46. and 87. that Catholiks in Q. Elisabeths dayes, and since, did not suffer *merely and immediately for religion*, doth insinuate, that they did suffer partly and mediatly for religion And what he addeth ibid. *they suffered for violation of civil lawes, as either for not acknowledging the political Supremacie of the King in Ecclesiastical causes* (he omitteth *al.*) *over Ecclesiastical per-*

sons, which is all, that we assert (but not all which Q. Elisabeth chalenged) *Or else for returning into the Kingdom, qualified with forbidden orders, as the lawes of the land doe not allow, or lastly, for attempting to seduce some of the Kings subjects from the religion established in the land. In all these cases* (saith he) *beside religion, there are some things of election*: which is to confesse, that in al the pretended cases of treason, there is religion, for which they suffer, but no shew of true treason, but onely of election of matters of religion. But how can he terme that *politicall Supremacie*, which is Supremacie in all causes, to wit, Ecclesiastical, or religious, unles he accounts religion policie? Or how can he esteeme it treason, to come into England with Preistlie Orders, or to diswade men from Heresie, though established by wicked law? Might not thus S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* have been condemned by

by *Nero* of treason, for coming to Rome with forbidden orders, and seducing his subjects from religion established in his Empire? One thing is, whether the Kings Supremacie in Ecclesiastical causes be lawful, or no, whether Priestly orders be lawful, or no: but surely they are no matters, of treason, or of state, but of religion. And who suffer for them suffer for religion, whether true or false. If the present state should make it treason for a Protestant Minister or Bishop to come into England, were not they protestant Martyrs, if they suffered for it? Wherefore p. 84. he seemeth to confess, that the laws made against Catholiks, were cruel and unjust: For he saith, *The truth is this, a hard knot must have a heavie Male*, and he could wish, that all seditious opinions, and *over rigorous Statuts*, with the memorie of them, were buried together in perpetual

oblivion. Which lenitie, perhaps his owne persecution hath taught him: for as S. Austin noteth, the wolf crieth mercie whiles he his under the lions pawes. Besides, c. 6. c p. 159. he saieth, *Our holy orders are the same they were in substance*, How then can it be treason, and not a matter of religion, to returne into England with priestly orders, if these be one and the same in substance with protestant orders? Doth not this give the puritans and independents just cause to condemn protestant Ministers of treason, as protestants condemn Catholik Priests, seeing in substance they are popish Priests, and therefore guiltie in substance of their pretended crime? Wherfore thus I argue, popish preisthood, and protestant Ministerie, are in substance all one, Therefore if that be treasonable, this also is, or thus. If popish

c *See also c. 2. p. 29.*

Priests

Priests, can be lawfully forbidden by protestants to return into England contrarie to their lawes, under paine of treason, protestant Ministers may be also forbidden by puritans or Independents, to returne into England contrarie to their lawes, under paine of treason. Because (L. D. saith) a popish priest, and a protestant Minister, is in substance all one, and [as I suppose in this argument] forbidden to be in England by the like lawes. And that popish priests die in England for their conscience; K. James in his Apologie for the oath of allegiance. p. 127. confesseth in these words. *I doe constantly maintaine, that which I have said in my Apologie; That no man ether in my time, or in the late Queens, ever died here for his conscience, Priests and Popish Churchmen onely excepted, that receive orders beyond seas.* For why doth he except preists from his denial, *that any died for con-*

science, unless he meant, that they died for conscience? And *Camden in vita Elizabethæ an.* 1581. confesseth, that she did think, that *most of the poor Priests* whom she executed, were not guilty of treason. His words are: *Plerosque ex his misellis Sacerdotibus, exaitii in patriam constandi conscios fuisse, non credidit.* And yet she executed them for treason.

Not thought guiltie of treason.

A breef Survey of L. D. his

FOVRTH CHAPTER

1. L. D. in his fourth Chapter, intendeth to prove, that the K. and Kingdom of England, in their separation from Rome did but vindicate their ancient libertie. And this he proveth because, some Kings of England have resisted the Popes ordinancies. Wherein he faileth many wayes. First in supposing, that whatsoever Kings do, they doe lawfully. Secondly, in not distinguishing *Power*, and the *Exercise of power*; well may Kings sometimes resist the Exercise or acts of papal power and yet acknowledg the power. For as the Apostle said of himself

Bellarm. l. 2. de pont. c. 12.

himself 1. Cor. 6. *Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt.* it may well fall out, that the practise of papal power is not expedient, in this or that circumstance. But if he would indeed prove, that K. Henrie 8. did but vindicate his ancient libertie, he should prove, that English Kings before him, did chaleng to be *Heads of the Church immediatly under Christ*, by which headship (as it was expressed in K. Edwards time) *all jurisdiction, both in spiritual and temporal causes, descended from the crown.* This libertie or freedom from all jurisdiction under Christ, and jurisdiction in all causes Spiritual and temporal, never any King of England before K. Henrie chalenged, but plainly professed the contrarie subjection. For first they permitted appeale to Rome in Ecclesiastical causes, as is evident in S. Wilfrides case, who was never

Kings of England professed subjection.

never reproved or diſliked for his repealing twiſe to *Rome*. They never diſliked that profeſſion of St: *Auſtins* fellow Miſſioners in Bedæ l. 2. c: 4. *That the ſea apoſtolick had ſent them to preach in* Britannie, *as ſhe is accuſtomed to do in al the world*: They never diſliked that Saint *Gregory* in S: Bedæ l. 1, c. 29: ſhould ſubject all the Prieſts of Brittanie under S. *Auſtin*, and give him power to erect two Archiepiſcopal ſeas, and twelve ſeas under each of them. They never diſliked that *St. Mellid* ſhould bring the decrees of the Roman ſynod to be obſerved by the Church of *England*, as the ſame Bedæ l: 2: c: 4. They willingly admitted a Biſhop of *Canterbury* ſent to them, and choſen by the Pope, as the ſame Bedæ relateth l: 3: c: 29. They acknowledged Saint *Peter* the ſpecial porter of Heaven, whom they would obey in all things, Bedæ l: 3. c: 25.

Beda l: 5: c: 20:

They

They publickly engraved in the front of their Churches, that St. *Peter* was higher in degree then St. *Paul*, as is to be seen in *Camdens* Britannie p. 192. al 165: They suffered their Bishops to teach, that St. *Peter* had a *d* Monarchie, was next after Christ, the foundation of the Church, and that neither true faith, nor good life, would save out of the vnitie of the Roman Church. They admitted Legats of the pope, whom he sent to examin the faith of the English Church, Bede l. 4. c. 18. They at the commandement of the pope, caused divers Bishopricks to be erected, as is evident in Edward the Elder: Malmes burie l. 2. Regum, c. 9: They with all humilitie admitted *e* Legats of the pope, in the time of Kinulfus and Offa, and admitted the erection of a new Archbishoprick in England

d L. 2, *Florum*, c. 5,

e. L. 2. *Flor*. c. 11.

England. They professed, that it belonged to Bishops, to punish priests and religious King *Edgar apud Ealredum in orat, ad Episcopos*, and that those did not belong to Kings, but to Archbishops, as K. *Withredus* professed *apud Spelman in Concil.* pag. 192. They suffered their subjects to profess, that *Qui non f communicat Ecclesiæ Romanæ, hæreticus est, Quidquid ipsa statuerit, suscipio, & quod damnaverit, damno.* They endited their letters to the Pope in these words: *Summo & universali Ecclesiæ pastori Nicolao, Edwardus, Dei gratia, Angliæ rex, debitam subjectionem, & omnimodam, servitium.* And to omit innumerable more such professions, of their subjection, which may be seen almost in every Christian English King before Henrie 8 they professed, that it was *Heresie to deny, that the Pope omni g præsidet creaturæ.* And what greater power did

f *Ealred serm. 15. in c. 14. Isai.*

g See Flo. res Eccl: Ang: l: 5. c: 30. c: 17: Walſingam An: 1336:

did ever the pope challenge, then is here profeſſed, that he hath, by the Kings, by the Biſhops, by the people of *England?* and if eny popes have (as men) abuſed this authority, and given kings or people cauſe to reſiſt, or riſe againſt them, yea to make laws againſt them, we defend not their abuſes, but maintain their authority. For what authority, temporall or ſpirituall, ſhould ſtand if it be to be rejected for mens abuſes. Yet this, and no more, prove the deeds, and laws of ſome Engliſh Kings, which L: D. bringeth in this Chapter, made againſt the abuſes of papal authority, not againſt it ſelf, or right uſe thereof.

Lawfull ſometimes to reſiſt the Pope:

Doth not *Bellarmin* l: 2: *de Pontif* c: 29. ſay; *Sic ut licet reſiſtere Pontifici invadenti corpus, ita licet reſiſtere invadenti*

vadentianimæ, vel turbanti rempublicam: & multo magis, ſi Eccleſiam deſtruere niteretur; and *L: D:* c 2: p: 20: ſaith: *We ask no more:* Forſooth if he may be judge, what doth iuvade the ſoule; why may not a puritan judg ſo of proteſtants Biſhops: and much leſſe is it lawfull to ſeparate from papall authority, becauſe ſome popes have abuſed it, and leaſt of all, from the whole Church, for ſome popes abuſes of their authority; Do not puritans cry out againſt the abuſes of proteſtant Biſhops, was it therefore lawſul for them to depart from Epiſcopal authority, or from the proteſtant church? where the proteſtant Biſhops faults, faults of the proteſtant Church, or is it lawfull to depart from a Church, for the fault of her Biſhops? you

ſee

you see how dangerous to protestant Bishops, and their church, had been your doctrine, and practise against the pope, and the Roman church. For what you have done against papal authority, puritans have done against episcopal.

protestant Bishops have made the way to their own destruction.

2. Moreover King *Henry* by making himself *head of the English Church immediatly under Christ*, did free himself not only from papal authority, but from Episcopal, and all spiritual authority either abroad, or in *England*. For who is head of a company, is under none of that company. And I suppose *L. D.* wil not say that all Kings before *Hen.* 8. were free from all spiritual authority. For so they should not have accounted themselves sheep of the English fold, but rather su-

ſupream paſtore of it. Wherefore I ask was King *Henry* under ſome ſpiritual paſtoral authority in *England*, or not? If he was, then was he not ſupreme head of the Engliſh Church If not, then was he either ſupream paſtor of the Engiſh Church, or a Sheep under no paſtor on earth.

A brief ſurvey of L. D.

FIFTH CHAPTER.

1. L. D. in his fifth chapter intendeth to prove, that the Britiſh Church were ever free from foraign juriſdiction for the firſt 600. years, and ſo ought to continue. For proof of this, he ſaith. Firſt, that all the Apoſtles were equall in power, and in all things, except priority in order, becauſe (as Bellarmin 4. de

pont

Pont: c. 21 confesseth by these words *As my father sent me, so I send you*, Christ *endued them with all fulnes of power, that mortal men were capable of.* But besides that Bellarmin hath not those words, Bellarmin else telleth him withal, that this is meant not in respect of themselves, but in respect of other men. And he proveth it, because Christ said particularly to S: Peter, *Upon this rock I will build my Church: Confirm they bretbren: Feed my Sheep.*

Mat: 16. *Luk:* 22. *Joan:* 21.

Which words must needs import some power or authoritie over the rest of the apostles, because they were a part of Christs church, and his Sheep, as wel, or more then any others, and he confirmeth it out of holy Fathers, who not onely say, that Saint *Peter* was made head of the apostles, but also add, that he was made head of them to *take away occasion of Schisme*

S. Hieron.

made

2 *Cont Jovin.* which onely prioritie of power or authority could do; and I ask where *Christ* did give meer *priority of order to* S: *Peter?* Surely not in the words cited, for they speak of prioritie of power, as *the rock of the Church, the Pastor of Christs sheep*, include power of authority over the Church, and over Christs Sheep, for the rock is to uphold the Church; and the pastor to govern it.

Rock and Pastor include authority:

2. And hence it will clearly follow, that either the universal jurisdiction of the rest of the apostles was only for term of their lives, and so could not descend to their successor or at least, the exercise of practise of their universal power, was but for term of life, which sufficeth to our purpose. For St: *Peter* being head in power, over all their successors, he could

could(at least) limit the exercise of power how large soever it were as he should find expedient for the good of the Church, and without such power to limit the jurisdiction of Bishops, (though successors of the apostles) or at least limit their exercise of it, St: *Peter* had not had sufficient power to avoid confusion, wrangling, and schisme in the *Church* as is evident, if every Bishop had as ful power over all other christians as the apostles had, and also as full leave to use it. For they were not like to be so vertuous and discreet as the Apostles were, In the beginning of the church it was needful that all the Apostles had universal jurisdiction; But not, that all their successors, no, nor convenient. But for Saint *Peter*, and his successors it was needful they should have both the universall power of the Apostles, and also faculty to exercise it, because they were

were appointed heads of the univer-
sal Church which they could not
govern without both universal pow-
er over the church, and also univer-
sal exercise thereof; and so
it is no *drowsie dream* (as L.
D. p: 89 calleth it,) to say that Apo-
stles had both universall authoritie,
and also use of such authority only
for terme of life, but Saint *Peter* had
both for himself, and also for his suc-
cessors; because the successors of the
other apostles were not to be gover-
nors of the universal church as Saint
Peters were, and therefore needeth
not universal authoritie and univer-
sal use; God giveth not power where
there is no need: but successors of
Peter were to be governors of the u-
niversal Church, and therefore nee-
deth both universal power, and uni-
versal use of it. For there must be al-
waies

Successors of the Apostles were not to be governors of the universall Church as successors of S: Peter were to be.

waies some pastor of Christs Sheep, as Saint *Peter* was. For neither can Christs Church stand long without a rock, nor his sheep without a pastor; and to such a rock, and such a pastor, both universal jurisdiction, and exercise of it is necessarie.

3. After this p 90 L D enquireth the reason why the Bishop of *Rome*, should rather be successor to S: *Peter*, then the Bishop of *Antioch*: and saith, we produce no authoritie that he hath seen; but of a counterfeit *Egesippus*, that *Peter* flying out of *Rome*, Christ appeared to him, and bid him return and suffer for him. But if he had read Bellarmin l 2: de Pontif: c: 12. he should have found the same testified by S. *Marcellus* pope, by Saint *Ambrose*, and S: *Anathasius*; & though also that were not true, it would not prove that the pope is not successor to S *Peter ex esse*; but only that he is not so *jre divino*. To us it suffi-

seth

seth that the Bishop of *Rome* is St *Peters* successor, and this all Fathers testifie, and all the catholick church beleeveth, but whether he be so * *jure divino*, or *humano*, is no point of faith; and many things are *de fide*, which are not *de jure divino*, and also many things are *de fide*, wherof we know not certainly the reason why they are. It was the devils * question to *Eve*, *why did God forbid her to eat of the forbidden apple*. But why the Bishop of *Rome* should be. succcssor to Saint *Peter*, in his apostolical authority, rather then the Bishop of *Antioch*, the reason is manifest, becaus St. *Peter* h imself left the Bishoprick of *ntioch*, but continued Bishop of *Rome* till his death.

Sec Bellarmin l2 de pont, 12:

See Justin de expos: fides:

4. And after this L. D. spendeth many words about the institution of patriarchs and primates which we grant was but a humane institution, for better execution of Ecclesiastical power, as Saint *Peter* peculiarly took to look to the Jews, and Saint *Paul* to the Gentiles, and telleth us, that by the general councel of *Ephesus*, the Bishops of *Cyprus* were exempted from the patriarch of *Antioch*, because they had not been before under him; and then p. 97. biddeth us bring out our Registers, and shew what Episcopal jurisdiction popes exercised in *Britannie* for the first 600 years. To which I answer, first, it being known that few or no records of *b* british matters for the first 600 years remain, he doth unjustly demand such Registers: Secondly, granting that the pope

b See Gildas de excid: Brit:

pope was a patriarch of the west, and that *Brittanie* is a notable part of the West, it followeth evidently that he was patriarch of *Britannie*, unless the contrary be clearly proved, which remains for *L D.* to do to clear himselfe of schisme. Thirdly, though there be no british Registers of those 600 years, there are other authenticall records that Bishops of *Rome* have exercised Episcopal jurisdiction in Britannie, even in the first 600 years. For as I shewed in my Epistle to King *James*) *Metaphrastes* (a Grecian, and cited as a man of great authority in the consel of *Florence*,) did above 800 years ago testifie Saint *Peter* first Bishop of *Rome*, came into Brittanie, converted many, made Bishops, priest

c See novis provinc: Occid:

popes of the first 600 years have executed their authority in *Britan:*

and Deacons, and *Eusebius Pamphilii*, (our ancientest) Ecclesiastical historiographer) testifieth the same. And the same is acknowledged by English Catholicks, and protestants; S. *Eluterius* also the twelfe pope after S: *Peter*, sent hither his Legats; *Fugatius* and *Damianus* who baptized the King, Queen, and most of his people. And the next Pope S: *Victor* sent Legates into Scotland who Baptised the King, Queen and his Nobilitie, as testifie the Scottish Historics, aad others; and about the same time S. *Ninian* being *taught at* Rome, (saith S: *Bede* l. 3. c. 4.) *the faith of Christ* was thence sent, saith *Capgrave* in his life) to convert the South picts, who then inhabited the best part of *Scotland*: and about the year 429 pope *Celestin* in the first consecrated *Pal-*

See my Epistle to K: James.

ladius

us. and sent him to Scotland where as yet was no Bishop: and not forgetful of Ireland, sent thither also S. Patrik. And whereas at the same time the Britons began to be infected with the pelagian heresie, the same pope sent thither S. German, and Lupus to confute that heresie, and both Britons, Scots, Picts, and Irish willingly accepted these Legats of the popes, nor denied that they had any authority over them: and also in the 600 years, S. Gregory understanding that the English then were pagans, he procured of the Pope at that time to be sent to preach to them. but was recalled at the importunitie of the Romans, who would not part with so worthy a man, but as soon as he was himself Pope, sent hither *an* 596 S. Augustin, and his companions, and gave him

S Prosper in Chron.

power over all the Bishops of Britanie, and to erect two Archiepiscopal seas, and 24 Episcopall; by which we see how different the Britons case was from them of Ciprus. For if the patriarch of Antioch could have proved that his predecessors had used such jurisdiction over the Cipriant, as we prove that the popes have exercised over Britons, the counsel of *Ephesus* would never have exempted them from him. I add also, that *Galfrid* l. 9. c. 12 saith, that *Dubritius* primate of Britanie was, *Legate of the sea apostolik*, and that *d Sampson* had a pall from *Rome*, as evident in his life; wherefore untruly saith L. D. pag. 150, *that the pall was first introduced in the reigne of the Saxon Kings after 600 year.*

d Speed in descrip. Britan.

K. *James* acknowledged the pope to be the patriarch of the west,

of

of Chriſt. I may alſo add that K *James* in his Apologie for the oath of allegience p: 46, **alloweth the** pope to be yet patriarch of the Weſt. For thus he writeth; *I would with all my heart give my conſent, that the Biſhops of* Rome *ſhould have the firſt ſeat; I being a weſtern king, would go with the patriarch of the Weſt*; and in his ſpeech to the Parlament acknowledgeth the church of *Rome* to be their *mother church*, & ſo doth *Seravia* and others cited lib. 1, *de authore proteſt* c. 11, n 10. And why ſhould not L. D. allow him to be ſtil patriarch of the Weſt, whom King *James* allowed? The general councel of *Chalcedon* accurſed *Dioſcorus* though ſecond patriarch of the Church, for pronouncing judgment of depoſition againſt

So alſo Monta. cute Eccl: orig: parte poſt er: p: 158.

Pope *Leo* the great, and L. D. dare pronounce depesition of all Popes since *Boniface* 3. for more then 1000 years, and say, that they have all lost their patriarchate O intolerable presumption.

L: D: doth far more then Dioscrus did

3. And whereas p: 100, L. D. saith that the *British* Church *sided with the Eastern Churches for many hundred years*, he sheweth his great ignorance in brisish matters For first the *Britons* in their Countriman *Constantius* time joyned with the Roman church for the time of observing *Easter*, as himself testifieth in *Eusebius l. de vita Constantini, c:* 18. Secondly, *Britons* never cided entirely with the Eastern Churches, because they alwayes kept Easter on e sunday which the Eastern Churches did not.

eBeda l:3 c:4. 17:25

Third.

Thirdly, because *Colman* defending the *Britons* error, could fetch it no higher then *S. Columba*, who came into *Britannie* but *an.* 562. and Pope *Ihon* 4, in his *f* letters written *an.* 638 saith that at that time this heresie was but a little before risen in *Scotland*. What L. D, addeth of the *Brittish* Monks, whom he saith lost their lives for refusing to obey S *Austin*, and *S. Bedes* words (which say *Saint Austin* was dead long time before they were killed were not his, I have sufficiently refuted in *the prudential ballance l.* 1, c. 6, and in *l Florum*, 1 c. 7: to which I remit the Reader.

f Beda *l.* 2, c. 19:

A brief survey of L.D.

Sixt Chapter.

L. D. in his sixt Chapter of Schisme avoucheth, that though the British Churches had not been exempted from the popes jurisdiction; yet nevertheles kings by their imperiall prerogative, *have power to alter in the externall regiment of the church, whatsoever is of humane institution for the benefit and advantage of the body politick*; thus he, and this he proveth, because some Catholicks teach that to whom a kingdom is granted, all things are granted, without which a *Kingdom cannot be governed*, but this will not prove his saying. For be it so, that a king hath power

er

er to do whatsoever is *necessary* for government of his Kingdome, it will not follow that he can alter in the government of the church, *what is for the benefit of the kingdom*, if it be of humane institution, as L. D saith, *necessitie of kingdom, and benefit of the kingdome*, are different things. And kings may well have the power in the former, and sometimes not in the latter. Episcopally if what is for the benefit of the kingdome be contrary to the necessary good of the church, unless L. D. prefer a kingdom before the church, the body before the soul, and the earth before heaven. Besides a Kingdom is but a part of the church, and it is not in the power of any part onely for its particular profit to alter what is instituted by the universall church for her universal good, no more then is is in the power of a

part

part of the Kingdom, as one shire or province to alter for its privat interest what hath been decreed by Parlament for the good of the Kingdom. Wherefore wheras L D. p: 110. saith, *that three things are necessary to make a publick reformation, lawful; just grounds, due moderation, and sufficient authority.* No one of these was in King *Henries* reformation. For he had no just ground, because his ground was, that the Pope would not give him leave to forsake his lawful Wife, and take another. His proceeding therein was Tyrannical, because *a* Sup: c: 3. by fear he forced the *a* parlament to consent to his proceedings; and his authority was not sufficient both because it was the power of a small part of the Church against the whole, and because it was not in a mat-

matter of humane institution but divine, in which Kings have no authority to make alteration.

Two things therefore *L. D:* ought to prove First, that a particular Church can alter things which are instituted by the whole Church for the publick good; Secondly, that the regiment of the Church by the pope was of humane institution. Neither let him think he hath sufficiently proved that princes have power to meddle in spirituall matters, because some princes have done so, unlesse he think it sufficiently proved that Kings can offer sacrifice because *Saul* did so or whatsoever Princes do, is lawfull. Some princes might meddle in spiritual matters, either upon presumption, or upon zeal, *sed non secundum scientiam*, or either expres

1 Reg. 13 2 paral. c. 26.

or

or tacit approbation of *Bishops*, and what King *Henry* did in such matters was plainly against his own conscience, as appears by his frequent and *b* earnest desire to be reunited to the pope, so it might have been done without any disgrace to him, or restitution of Church goods which he had taken. And will L. *D.* venture his own and other mens souls upon the authority or fact of him who condemned it in his own conscience, & would have revoked it but for shame and covetousnes? himself pleaded guilty, and will you acquit him? Nay venture your own, and other mens salvation upon his confessed crime? King *Henrie* is often seeking to be reunited to the pope, confessed himself guilty of schisme, and L. D. defendeth him, & builds his own, and other mens salvation upon his fact.

b Sup. c. 3.

2.

2. What L: D. alledgeth, p: 120. out of a councel of Tours, that that councel allowed withdrawing of obedience from of the pope in certain cases, proveth not his purpose. First, because it is one thing to withdraw obedience from this or that pope, in this or that case, which we deny not, but may be lawfully done when the case is evidently just, and may be done without scandal, or damage to the Church, especially if it be done by publick authority of the Church, as it was from Pope *Liberius*, from *Gregorie* 12 in the councel of *Sienna*, and from *Ihon* 22 in the councel of *Constance*: Another thing is to withdraw *from papall authority it self*, as King *Henrie* did, and protestants

c *Bellarm*: l: 4: de Pont: c: 9

See L: D. p: 128: Where he calleth such threats of Kings personated shews to terrifie popes.

stants do, but neither the councell of *Tours*, nor any Catholick approve. We say the pope is as well instituted for the good of the Church, as the King for the good of the Kingdom. But yet, if the King abuse his power, we do not say that therefore it is lawfull to renounce regal authority, no more may we if the pope abuse his jurisdiction, renounce papal authority, especially it being immediatly instituted by God as regal is not. Wherefore for *L. D.* to defend protestants revolt from papal authority, it sufficeth not to shew that some popes have done some things prejudicial to *England*: but he must also shew what papal authority hath done those wrongs, and that papall authority of it self is prejudiciall to Kingdomes.

I

I and also, that howsoever some popes have temporally wronged *England*, far more popes have far more benefited it, both Temporally, and spiritually, as I have shewned in my Epistle to King *James*. And therefore it was even against humane prudence and policie for some wrongs by some popes to renounce all Nay, though some pope had done far more hurt both spiritual and temporall to *England* then they have done, it had not been lawful to have revolted from papal authority it self, no more then in the time of the Synagogue it had been lawful to revolt from the authority of the high Priest. Because papal authoritie is as wel instituted by God, as was authority of the high Priest, nor is it of it self any more cause of any evil, then that was.

What

What injustice happens, proceed of the persons in whom this authority is, not from the authoritie it self. And it were wicked sacriledg for faults of men to impugne sacred authority instituted immediatly by God.

3. But protestants have not only for faults of men revolted from authority instituted by God, but also for faults of some men in the Roman church, to wit, of some popes revolted from the Roman Church it self (as *Donatists* did from the catholick Church, for the pretended faults of *Cecilianus*) without proving, that the Roman Church ever knew of those faults or could redress them. Proue therefore that the universall, or whole Roman church knew of those wrongs which

L. D. p. 280. offences either given, or taken right or wrong do not weigh half so much as the unitie of Christians.

you

you say some popes have done to *England*, and also that she could redress them, or confess, that the whole Roman church is guiltless of them, and is not for them to be forsaken, unless you will say she is to be forsaken for no fault of her. You have forsaken the communion both of the pope, and of the Roman church, tel, why you have forsaken the communion of each of them, and impute not the faults of popes to the papacy, or papal authority. *The Pope, the papacy, and the Roman Church* are three different things, all which protestants have forsaken, and therefore they are bound to give *d* just cause, and necessary to salvation why they have forsaken each of them, or they must confess themselves guilty of Schisme.

d L. D. p. 10. 28, 27 110 p. 27.

And

And let them not think that what they bring to justifie their revolt from some popes, will justifie their revolt from the papacy it self, or from the *Roman* church: Whatsoever some popes have been, papacy or papal authority, and the universal *Roman* Church are holy, nor can give any just cause of revolt from them, *Protestants* have revolted from papacie as well as *Puritans* in *England* have revolted from Episcopacie, and as L: D. would not admit the faults in some protestant Bishops to be a sufficient cause of revolting from episcopacie, or from the *Protestant English church*, no more will we admit faults of some Popes to be a sufficient cause of revolting from papacy, or from the *Roman church*. Besides (as I have often said) they are separated in communion of Sacraments from all antient christian

ſtian Churches in the world. And what juſt cauſe of ſeparation have all thoſe Churches given them? And til you have juſtified your diviſion from all theſe 4; *popes, papacy, roman church and all antitent chriſtian Churches*, and alſo your union with any ſchiſmatical Church, you have not cleared your *prot:* Ch. from ſciſm.

L:D:hard ask to clear pro teſt:from ſchiſme:

4. What L.D p:809 talketh of a new creed, & of withdrawing the cup from the laity, is an old ſilly objection 1000 times anſwered by Catholicks, whoſe anſwers becauſe he doth not refute, I will not here ſpend time to confirm, eſpecially ſeeing that *Proteſtants* revolted from the *Pope*, and *Rome church*, long for that new creed as he cals it, which is nothing but certain points of *Cath:*

See proteſtants new Creed in my Collat: of ſcripture, p: 42,

faith propoſed to be ſworn of ſome Eccleſiaſtical Catholick perſons, as the 39 articles were in the proteſtants new creed propoſed by them to Miniſters. And as for the cup he knoweth that it was granted to the *Bohemians*, but ſeeing it did but littlegood with them, it is not like it would do more with proteſtants. But *L:D:* putteth this matter of the Cup onely to amuſe the ſimple; for he knoweth not only * *Luther*, but alſo divers Sacramentaries confeſs that this is an indifferent matter of it ſelfe and no juſt cauſe ſo ſeparate communion: And that

L:D: p:155:

*See Coccius to 1: p:1050: Hoſpin part:2:fol: 12: Bucer in Colloq: Ratisb:

Melanth:edit 2:loc:c:de abrogat:legis:& in colloq:Auguſt,apud Hoſpin:fol:98,Dailleus in Ap:c:7,Morton in *Appol*:l:2: c:4. The beginning at leaſt of proteſtancy was Schiſmatical:

pro-

protestants themselves give not the cup to such, as cannot drink wine; and howsoever this be, certain it is that protestants did not separate at first from the Roman Church, either for a pretended new creed, or for the cup, & therefore neither of these can justifie their first separation, and we ask what just cause protestants had at the first to separate from the Roman church. And if then they had no just cause to separate, they were at that time true Schismaticks, and so the beginning at least) of protestancy was Schismatical, and the Separates true Schismaticks, & consequently the present protestants guilty of the same crime, by defending the schisme of their ancienters, and succeeding them therein.

Vos hæredes esse Schismaticorum evidenter apparet: S: Optate l: 2:

What

What L. D. addeth in the same p: 190. that protestants in their reformation have altered no Articles of Religion, nor sacred rites, nor violated charitie, is but too manifestly untrue as I have shewed in *the plain confession of protestants* c: 8, and by the general Doctrine of protestants, that they differ from papists in* fundamental points necessary to salvation. Insomuch as *Perkins* in his Epistle dedicatorie of his *reformed Catholick*, saith: *It is a notable policie of the devil, which he hath put into the heads of sundrie men in this age, that our Religion, and the religion of the presen Church of Rome are all one for substance.* And if they had not altered

*Calvin 4, instit: 12, 2 cont: Wesi pelem p: 557, Whitat cont: 2, q: 6: c: 3 Perkins in symb: p 791, Chilling p: 312 See: de Author c: n: 13: and l: 1, c: 1: Note this:

ted some article of Religion, they could not so much as colorably justifie their revolt from the Roman Church, because* they teach, no separation is to be made in the Church, but for necessity of salvation.

Sud: c: 1: & inf: c: 9

5. In the 157 page L. D. avoucheth, *that Catholicks acknowledge the same possibility of salvation to protestants, as protestants do to them that is, to such of either Church respectively as do not err wilfully, but use their utmost endeavours to find out the truth.* This he proveth, because I say in *the protestants plain confession*, c. 13, p: 152, 153. *If they grant not salvation to such papists as they count invincibly ignorant of Roman errors but only to such as are invincibly ignorant of them, they have no more charity then we. For we grant Church saving faith, and salvation to such protestants as are*

invincibly ignorant of their errors: here he endeth, but I add p. 153. *But yet we never grant true church saving faith, or salvation to protestant church, or to any formal protestant. For such as are invincibly ignorant of their errors are not formal protestants, but rather* protestantibus credentes, *as S.* Augustine *distinguisheth of Heretick, and* Hæreticis credentes. In which words, I plainly deny saving faith or salvation to *the protestant church or a formal protestant*, whereas protestants allow saving faith, and salvation to the Romish church, and to formal papists, as I shewed l. 1. of the author *of protestancy*, c. 2, and l. 1, of *distinction of fundamentals, and not fundamentals* c. 2. Whence L. D. citeth other words of mine, that *who hold the fundamentall points of faith, and innocently err in not fundamentals may be saved*; True, but protestants add, that even such as

err

err in *fundamental articles* and also who err *sinfully in not fundamentals* may be saved, as I shewed l. 1 ciat. *de Authore* c. 3, and l. 1 of *distinction of fundmentals* c 2, by plain confessions of learned protestants which L. D. should have taken notice of, and shewed why we should not believe them, what protestants teach in this matter, rather then himself.

6 What he saith p: 158: that their separation is from our errors not from our Church sheweth his ignorance what our Church is: For our Church is a society partly in our pretended errors, and therefore who separate from them separate from our church, as I have shewed l: 2 of the distinction *of fundamentals and not fundamentals*, c: 5: Besides they have separated from our communion in Sacraments, and from our Officers, both

which are essential to our church What he addeth p:159 that protestants *do not arogate to themselves either a new church, or a new Religion, or new holy orders*; First is false as I have shewed by innumerable testimonies of protestants l:2:of the *Author of protestancy*, c:13: Secondly it convinceth protestants of their schisme, for if the church, their religion, their holy orders are the same with ours, what need had they to go out of ours for salvation sake, or what need have they to continue out of it? For what seek we in a church but salvation? And where is the same church, same religion, same orders; the same salvation may be had.

What he addeth ib: that protestants positive articles are those general truths about which there is no controversie; *our negotiation*

is only of humane controverted additions, is partly false; because their principal positive article of *justification by special faith* is most of all in controversie, and if their negative articles be not points of their faith, but humane matters what do they in their confessions of faith? are they not beleeved of protestants to be divine truths taught in scripture as wel as their positive articles? *Have* not protestants a positive faith of their negative articles as weil as of their positive Articles? Do not they beleeve that God hath as well taught those negatives points as the positive? *Turks* and Jews do not believe those nega-

i Perkins Cath: refor contr: 4: c: 5: Apol: confess: Aug: c: de pœnitentia: Daneus contr: 1, p: 29.

Negative articles are points of faith with protestants.

tives, but proteſtants more over beleeve them to be Gods word. And their faith (as far is differeth from Roman) conſiſting almoſt wholly of beleeving ſuch negative points to be Gods words is rightly termed a negative faith or religion. *Turks* or Jews have no faith or beleef that the bleſſed Sacrament for example is the true body of Chriſt, but proteſtants have a poſitive faith or beleef that it is not Chriſts body, and the like is of ſuch other negative points of proteſtancy: If proteſtants did only ſay, they do not beleeve the Euchariſt to be the body of chriſt, (as Turk and Jews ſay) we would no more ask of them any proof for that point then we do of *Turks* and Jews, but ſeeing they profeſſe to beleeve with divine faith

Difference of Infidels and proteſt concerding negative points:

faith, that it is not Christs body we justly exact Gods word for such negative beleef.

7 And what finally *L D.* addeth p. 259 cit, *that protestants are ready in preparation of mind to beleeve and practise whatsoever the catholick Church, even of this age doth universally and unanimously beleeve and practise* is to smal purpose more then a figg leaf was to cover *Adams* nakedness, because he meaneth not the true reall catholick Church of this age which is she, which is really spread all the world over, and really undevided in any substantial point of a Church, to wit in profession of faith, communion of Sacraments, and lawful Ministerie. If he had a true preparation of mind to beleeve what such a real catholick church universally beleeves, and practiseth the matter

Hæretico pacem cum omnibus scent: tertul: præscrip.

were ended. But he meaneth by the catholick Church an imaginary church or multitude of what christians soever, catholicks, hereticks, schismaticks, who agree in fundamental points (the number of which none of them can determine,) howsoever they disagree in other points of fait & wholly in communion of Sacraments and Government of the church, For such a multitude though spread over the world is but an imaginary church of Christ never founded by him no more then heresie or schism is, nor ever dreamed of by the holy Fathers, but framed meerly in the imagination of protestants, that they may have some pretence of a catholick church. We have out of scripture that the church which Christ instituted

Act: 2: 42:
1 Cor: c: 11
Cant: 6 v. 8
Joan c: 10: 11:
Rom: 12: v: 5:

stituted was one, and undevided in profession of faith, communion of Sacraments under his lawfull Ministers. Let L. D. shew out of Scripture where Christ instituted a Church divided in such points, or that it can be so divided, and yet be substantially Christs Church, and let him not only say it, for it is a main point in which he is not to be beleeved upon his bare word.

A brief survey of L: D.

SEVENTH CHAPTER.

1. IN his seventh Capter p. 160 L: D: saith, that *all Princes and republicks of the roman communion do in effect the same thing* (which King *Henrie* 8 and Church of England did) *when they have occasion, or at the least do plead for its*

How manifestly untrue this is, is evident by the oath of supremacie made by King *Henrie*, and his church which I will set down as King *James* setteth it in his Apologie p: 48, *I A: B: do utterly testifie and declare in my conscience that the Kings highness is the only supream governor of this Realm, and all other his Highness dominions and countries, as wel in all spiritual or Ecclesiasticall things or causes as temporal. And that no forraign prince, person prelate, state or potentate hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, supertority preeminence, or authority Ecclsiasticall or spiritual within this Realms. And therfore I utterly renounce and forsake all forraign jurisdictions, superiorities, and authorities.* In which Oath are sworn five things. Firtt, that the King of *England* is not only chief Governor, but also onely and supreme Governor. Secondly, not only

only in some, but *all Ecclesiasticall things and causes.* Thirdly, *as wel in all ecclesiasticall causes as temporall.* Fourthly, *that no forraign person or prelate hath any spiritual jurisdiction, power or superiority in England.* Fifthly *all forraign jurisdiction, superiority or authorty is utterly renounced.* No one of all which any catholick Prince or Republick ever practised or pleaded for. I denie not but some Catholick princes have sometimes medled in ecclesiastical causes but that they medled in all or in any; *as the only supreme governors of such causes, and as well in them as in temporal causes,* or that they *renounced utterly all foraign ecclesiastical authority;* or finally made their subjects to swear al this is most false. No this is the first new creed of our protestant *English* church in which is hath divided it self

in

from the universal church, but also from all antient christian Churches in the world, and therefore is become both hereticall and schismatical.

lv 2 But let us see how he proveth that christian Princes have in effect done the same which K: *Henrie*, and protestants in *England* have done; First he proveth it, because K: *Henrie* did convocate ecclesiasticall synods, and so did *Charls* the great, and other Emperors. Secondly, because K: *Henrie* made himself last Judg of grievances in causes ecclesiastical. So did *Lodovick* the feurth in in his own case again *Ihon*, p: 22. Thirdly, K: *Henrie* took upon him the patronage of Bishopricks; so did *Frederick* the first; Fourthly, King *Henrie* forbad appeals to *Rome*, so did *Frederick* the first; Fiftly K: *Henrie* declared the popes bulls to be

p:181: void the Emperors did not so generally, but they took upon them to judg whether popes did err or no; Sixtly, King *Heurie* took away the popes annates, and by the concordate between the Germans, and *Nicolas* the 5 the *Annats* are in part remitted or taken away; Seventhly, King *H.* imposed an Oath of fidelitie upon his subjects as well ecclesiastical as temporal, so did Frederick the first. Lastly, King *H.* abolished the Jurisdiction of the Bishops of *Rome* within his dominions; *The Emperors* (saith L D. p: 184) *did not so*, And therein contradicts himself when p. 160, he saith that *all princes of the* Roman *communion have in effect done the same which K: H. did, or at least do plead for it*; and p. 167. *the Emperors have done as much in relation to the Court of Rome as K. of Eng. or have they done the same in effect.*

and

and as much to the Pope as King Henrie hath done; who did not abolish the popes jurisdiction as King *Henrie* did, which is the main difference, and which made him an heretick, whereas other Princes remained Catholicks?

I deny not but some catholick Princes have done some things contrary to the jurisdiction of the pope in ecclesiastical causes, but no one of them ever took to himself papal jurisdiction, and denied it; to the pope as King *Henrie* did. one thing is to *disobey papal authority*, another to *deny papal authoritie*: That may befal to a Catholick this is to make hereticks. Besides, whatsoever any catholick princes did disobediently in ecclesiastical causes, they did not profess that they did it in quality only of *supreme governors as wel in ecclesiastical causes as temporal, renouncing all*

for

foraign ecclesiasticall authority as King *Henrie* did. This profession proper to King *Henrie* divided him from the Roman church, and consequently made him and his heretical or schismatical, and was the beginning of his schisme (for it was a voluntary division made him from the faith of the univer. church) and not the excommunicating of him made by the pope for his divorce from his lawful Wife; his excommunication was a punishment of his sin of divorce from his Wife: that was his far greater sin in divorsing himself from the church.

3 But seeing *L D.* hath alledged divers facts of catholick princes in disobeying papal authority, and thence inferreth that they did as much as K. *Henrie*, who not only disobeyed, but also denied papal authority; let us alledg both more

Emperors who have professed that they had no authority in ecclesiastical causes, and avowed papall authority; *Constantin* the Great openly professeth *that he could not judg of Bishops*, witnes Rufinus lib: 2, c 2, Valentinian Epistola ad Theodosium: *All antiquity hath given the principality of priesthood over all to the Bishop of the city of Rome*; Theodosius Junior Epistola ad Synodum Ephennam; *It is not lawful for him that is not a Bishop to meddle with ecclesiastical matters* Valentinian the elder; *It is not lawfull for me who am of the people to search curiously such matters, lest priests, who have care of these meet where they please* witnes Sozomen, l: 6 histor: c. 7, Basilius Emperor in the 7. synod speaketh thus to the laitie. *It is not lawful for you to treat of ecclesiastical causes*. Charles the Great in Cantz'u l. 1, Metropolis c. 7, pro-

fes.

By whose authority Charls the great medled in spiritual matters:

seth, *that he gave the Ch, of Breme to St.* Wilihade *by command of the high Bishop, and universall pope* Adrian, *and by the councel of* Lul, *and all Bishops that were present.* By which words we see by whose authority he medled in spiritual matter, *Justinian* Emperor Epistola ad Ioan 2: (which is in the code) *We suffer not any thing which belongs to the state of Churches not to be known to your holiness who is head of all holy Churches;* To these I add, that K. *Edgar* a Ealred edita Beo: *a* in his oration to the Bishops professeth that to him it belongeth to provide for the necessities of the Ministers of the Church, Monks and Nuns, but to *Bishops the examion of their lives, if they live continently, &c.*

And

And Withred King of Kent in Spelman de concil Angl. p: 192 *It belongeth to the King to appoint Princes, Dukes, or secular governors, but to the Metropolitan to direct and govern Churches of God; to chuse, appoint, sanctifie and remove Abbots; Abbesses, Priests, Deacons least any of the flock of Christ the eternall pastor should stray:* And to omit many others King *b Edward* the 3 professeth that it it is heresie to deny that the pope *præsidet omni creaturæ.* Thus we see how plainly these Emperors and kings disavow all authority in Ecclesiastical causes and yeeeld it to the popes and Bishops; and it is power or authority in spirituai matter, which we deny that prince have challenged; we deny that some princes especially in anger or passion have done some thing against this

b Walsingam: 1336:

in

in spiritual matters no more then we denie that some have sometimes disobeyed even the divine authority it self. But as from their obedience to God, we may not infer that they denied divine power, so neither from their obedience to the pope may we infer they denied papal authority. Did K: *Henrie* 8 at the reformation of the English Church no more but tread in the steps of his most renowned ancestors, who flourished whilst popery was in it's Z:nith? as *LD.* praises it p:3. Did he no more but tread in the steps of K: *Withered*, K: *Edgar*, K. *Edward* the 3. and other such his Ancestors?

A brief survey of L.D

Eight Chapter.

1. L. in his eight chapter undertaketh to prove that the Church, or rather the court of *Rome* are casually guilty both of this, and almost all other schisms in the Church, Which he intendeth to prove 4 wayes. First, *by their seeking to usurp a higher place or power in the body ecclesiastical, then of right is due unto them;* Where by *this Schisme* I suppose he he meaneth either the schisme which the English protest: made, or which protestants generally made in *Luthers* time. Next that by *casually* he meaneth a just and necessa-

Cathedra quid tibi fecit ecclesiæ romanæ. Aug: l: 2: cont: petil: c: 51:

cessary cause, so as their division from the church or Court of *Rome* is freed thereby from sin. Now neither proveth he, that there can be given a just cause of schism, nor that the court, nor Church of *Rome* gave either King *Henrie* or *Luther* just or necessarie cause to depart from her communion. It is clear al the cause which the Court of *Rome* gave to K: *H:* to depart from it, was *Clement* the 7: excommunication of him for leaving his lawful Wife, with whom he had lived 20 years, and marrying another. And was this a necessary cause? could not K: *H*, have been saved without separating, though he were excommunicated? Or was this excommunication a fault of the Rom: church? can it be proved

L: D: p: 10, 27, 21. 110

See stow and Cooper an: 1530, Wevers mon: p: 78:

the

the Roman church either caused it, or approved it? Nay did not divers of the Roman church, both then and since dislike it, not as unjust but untimely and imprudent? Nay doth not the glosa in Math. 13 cited by S. Thomas in Supplem q 22. art 5 say, that a *Princeps & multitudo non sunt excommunicandi*; Which is most true, when the multitude is like to adhear to the King, as it was most likely that *England* would follow K. *H.* What just, what necessary cause of salvation had King *H.* to forsake the Roman church, because the Pope excommunicated him, seeing the Roman church neither caused, nor *b* approved, the excommunication of him; and much less

a 24, q. 3: c. 2. si habes:

b Thuan l. 1. an. 2334: Bellaius l. 4 an: 1533. Bzovius an. 1540. Spondan an, 1534: Perom epist. ad Hen. 4:

cause

cauſe had *Luther* to forſake the *Roman* Church, for the *c* abuſe of ſome preachers of indulgences, whom the pope at that time rebuked ſeverely? could not *Luther* be ſaved in the *Roman* Ch: if ſome preachers abuſed indulgencies; which kind of men both the *d* pope & roman church have ever condemned? how then is the Roman church guilty of the ſchiſm of K:*H*: and of *Luther*, unleſs cauſe be rather ſought then given? For juſt and neceſſary cauſe of ſalvation, the *Rom*:*Ch*. gave neither to K.*H*, nor to *Luther*. But let us ſee how L.D. will prove that either the Ch: or Court of *R*: were caſually guilty of this, and almoſt of all other ſchiſms in the Church.

c Hoſpin: part 2: hiſt: fol: 3 Luther, tom: 1, fol: 13: Elienſis 112: reſp: ad apol: Bellar: Kennitius de indulg in part: 4:

d Concel: Later: c: 61: Luga: vien: trident, Seſſ: 5, c: 2, Seſ: 21, c: 9:

2

2. First (saith he) *they make the church of Rome to be not only the Sister of all other patriarcal churches, and mother of many churches, but the Lady and Mistress of all churches, to be an absolute foundation for al persons, times and places which is proper to Christ, they make it the root of christian Religion or at least of all spiritual jurisdiction. And in all this by the church of Rome they mean the pope.* But how al this was the cause either of K. H: *Note this* or of *Luthers* or of protestants first revolt, not one word. Nor how all this should be a just and necessary cause of revolt; For all this includeth no more then the popes supremacie; For in that the pope is supream pastor of the universall church, the church of *Rome* is Mistress of all other churches, is the external and subordinate foundation of all Christians in all times and places;

And

And to be an *external and ſubordinate foundation* of all Chriſtians, is not proper to Chriſt, nor can agree to him. But that the Pope is the root of all ſpiritual Juriſdiction, is not the Doctrine of the univerſal Roman Church. And why can not a man be ſaved, if he profeſs all this? Is this againſt ſome fundamental point of Faith? And if not againſt any foundamental point, no neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation as *e* Proteſtants generally teach. Surely the Popes ſupremacy is neither againſt the *f* three Creeds, nor the firſt four generall Councels, yea, allowed by ſome principal * Proteſtants. And L. D. profeſſeth p. 15. *to exclude none from hope of ſalvation, who profeſs the ancient faith, of the Apoſtles and Primitive Fathers, eſtabliſhed in the firſt general Councels, and comprehended in*

e *Sup.* c. 1. *and* *Infra.* c.

1 L. D. c. 2. p. 15.

* *Infra* c. 3. n. *vlt.*

the Apostolick, Nicen *and* Athanasian *Creed*. And surely, all Roman Catholicks profess all this. So that Protestants may finde salvation amongst them, and so have no necessity to forsake their Communion.

3. But in the second place L. D. p. 230. *presseth the crime of Schisme against the Court of* Rome, *because it obtrudeth new Creeds, and new Articles of faith, and especially this, That it is necessary for every Christian, under pain of damnation, to be subject to the Bishop of* Rome, *as* Vicar *of Christ: whereby some, who never heard of* Rome, *are subject to damnation.* And also because *Rome* doth exclude out of her Communion, not onely Protestants, but also all the Churches of *Africk*, *Asia*, *Greece*, *Russia*, which contain three times more Christian Souls, than the Church of *Rome*. But how this was any cause of *K.* H. or Luthers, or the first Protestants revolt,

revolt, no word, nor how this is a new Creed, or new Article of faith, nor how this is againſt any fundamental point of faith neceſſary to ſalvation. We profeſs, that it is neceſſary to ſalvation to be under the Pope, as Vicar of Chriſt, but we ſay not, that it is neceſſary *neceſſitate medii*, ſo as none can be ſaved, who do not actually believe it, unleſs it be ſufficiently propoſed to them. Neither doth the Roman Church excommunicate all the Chriſtians of *Africk*, *Aſia*, *Greece*, and *Ruſſia*, but onely ſuch, as vincibly, or ſinfully erre, ſuch as are formal, or obſtinate Hereticks, or Schiſmaticks. For excommunication is onely againſt obſtinacy. *Si Eccleſiam non audierit, ſit tibi ſicut Ethnicus & Publicanus.* In thoſe Churches there are innumerable, who are but *credentes Hæreticis & Schiſmaticis*, becauſe the Catholick faith was never

Matth. 8.

ſufficiently preached to them. And theſe, the Pope doth not excommunicate. Nor doth he exclude formal Hereticks, or Schiſmaticks, but juridically declare them to be excluded, for by their Hereſies, or Schiſmes, they had already excluded themſelves, or juridically confirmeth, their exeluſion began by themſelves. It is their wilfull ſeparation from the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, which makes them guilty of Schiſms, not the Popes excommunication of them. Schiſm is their fault, and the Popes excommunication of them for Schiſme is a puniſhment, and juridical declaration of their ſin What? L.D. addeth, p. 232. *For divers years in the beginning of* Q. Elizabeth, *there was no Recuſant known in* England, *but even thoſe, who were moſt addicted to the Roman opinions, frequented Proteſtant Churches*; is moſt falſe, as appareth by the depoſition of all the Catholick

tholick Biſhops, except one, and by many more, who are named in *Sanders* viſible Monarchie. And as Camden in the life of Q. *Elizabeth* wrote, 1559. *eighty Curates, fifty Prebendaries, fifteen Preſidents of Colledges, twelve Arch-deacons, as many Deans, ſix Abbots and Abbeſſes*, left their places, and beſides, all the Biſhops, but one.

4. But to *lay the Ax to the Root of Schiſm* (ſaith L. D. p. 232. *the Papacie it ſelf, qua talis, as it is now maintained by many, with ſuperiority over general Councels, and a power to confirm, or reject their ſanctions, is the cauſe either procreant, or conſervant of all, or the moſt Schiſmes in Chriſtendom.* This he proveth, becauſe to rebel againſt the Catholick Church, and its repreſentative, a general Councel, which is the laſt viſible judge of controverſies, and the ſupream Eccleſiaſtical Court, either is groſs Schiſm,

or there is no such thing as Schismatical pravity in the World. And here I would ask L. D. onely three questions. First, how Papacie, *as it is now maintained,* could be the cause of *K.* Henries, or *Luthers*, or Protestants first revolt from the Roman Church. Secondly, how Papacie, *as it is now maintained by many*, can be a just cause of revolting from, or continuing out of the Communion of the whole Roman Church, seeing not the whole, but onely *many* maintain the Papacy to be such, as he describeth. To rebel against a full, or compleat representative of the Catholick Church, that is, a general Councel with its head the Pope, I confess is gross Schisme, but not to resist an incompleat general Councel, as is a general Councel without its head, the Pope. In *England*, to resist the Parliament, joyned with the King, was gross Rebellion, but not to resist a Parliament wanting

wanting consent of the King. A compleat Parliament, is supreme Judg in *temporalibus*, but not na incompleat. And so a compleat general Councel, is supreme Judg in *spiritualibus*. What L. D. saith, that Popes have exempted themselves from the jurisdiction of an Oecumenical Councel; is no more, than that Kings have exempted themselves from the jurisdiction of a high Parliament.

Thirdly Whether Papacie *as it is now maintained by many*, be contrary to *the three Creeds, or four first generall Councels*, or against any fundamentall article necessary to salvation, and if not, how can it be a just and necessary cause of separation, according to Protestants? What he addeth that according to the generall Councel of Constance, the Pope is subject to a general Councel, and saith p. 224. *that*

woundeth deep, because Pope Martin 5. approved all, that was there made Conciliary, that is (saith L.D.) *done not depuites by onely of the Councel, but by the Councel it self.* But this wound is two wayes cured. First, because it is probable the Councel meant onely of doubtfull Popes, as then were three, of which every one pretended to be the true Pope: Secondly, because Martin 5. professed, he confirmed onely those decrees of that Councel, which were made *Conciliary*, that is after the manner of general Councels, which is, after due examination as this decree was not made but the other against Wicles heresie were. And surely *Conciliariter Conciliarly*, doth rather signifie *the manner of a Councel than a Councel as* L. D. expoundeth it. The words are, *Martinus Papa 5. dixit, quod omnia & singula, deter-*

Conciliariter, is councellike.

terminata, concluſa, & decreta in materiis fidei, per præſens Concilium conciliariter, tenere & inviolabiliter obſervare vòlebat. In which words, *præſens Concilium*, doth ſufficiently exclude the *Deputies* of the Councel, ſo that *conciliariter* needed not to be added to exclude them, but to exclude ſome manner of proceedings of that Councel, to wit, not Councel-like, without due examination. Nor doth he ſay that Popes are bound by ſuch decrees, but that he would obſerve them.

5. *Beſides theſe branches of Schiſm* (ſaieth L.D. p. 241. *there be yet two other novelites, chalenged by the Popes and their paraſites, An infallibility of judgement, and a temporal power over Princes directly or indirectly.* But ſeeing he confeſſeth, that neither of theſe is defined by the Roman Church, how can he ſay that they can be a juſt cauſe to depart from her

her communion, or how can he say, that they were the cause of the Protestants first revolting from her? Are these against any of the three * Creeds, or the four general Councels, or are they against any fundamental Article necessary to salvation. Let him not pick quarrels at the Roman Church: for *quærit occasiones, qui vult discedere ab amico*, but bring *i* just and necessary causes of Protestants departure from her communion, or else let him confesse, that he doth not justifie their Schisme. Every pretended cause, is not true, nor every true cause, is sufficient to revolt from the Church, but onely that, which is necessary for the salvation of soules, as commonly *k* Protestants teach. if he cannot shew this

* *L. D. C. 2. p. 13. L. D. never gives a necessary cause of forsaking the Roman Church.*

i L. D. p. 10. 27. 28. 110.

k Sup c. i. infra c. 9,

this, he must needs confesse, their separation was schismatical, & that continueth in a separation, which was schismatically begun, whatsoever he can now pretend for his continuance in it. But as himself saieth p. 25. *Quod ab initio fuit invalidum, tractu temporis non convalescit.* L.D.p. 279.

A brief survey of L. D.

NINTH CHAPTER.

1. IN his ninth chapter L. D. saith, that it is not enough to charge the Church of Rome, unlesse he discharge their own of the guilt of Schism. But he telleth not in what different things the Protestants charg the Church of Rome, & catholiks charge Protestants. For Protestants commonly do not charge the Church of Rome with

Protestants charge not the Romans with formal Schism.

Roman Church never went out of any other.

with formal Schism, as if she were a Schismatical Church, and had departed from the communion of any former true Church, with which before shee held communion. For such a church, they can name none: but at most they charge her for being the cause of Schism, as appeareth by L.D. proofes before a. c. 8. rehearsed, and refuted But Catholiks charge Protestants with formal Schism, for their departure from the communion of the Roman Church, with whom before they held communion, & which is a true Church in substance, and that without just & necessary cause. But now let us see, how he answereth our objections.

Tell from what Catholik Church, you did not separate in communion.

First (saith he p. 245.) *they object, that we have se-*

pa-

parated our ſelves from the Communion of the Catholik Church, To this he ſaith, *God forbid*, *Then we will acknowledg without any more to do, that we ſeparated our ſelves from Chriſt, and all his holy ordinances, and from the benefit of his paſſion and all hope of ſalvation.* But if by communion, he mean communion in Sacraments, and by the *Catholik Church*, he mean the true real Catholik Church, inſtituted by Chriſt, and not an imaginary Catholik Church, made in ſome Proteſtants brains, it is as clear as the Sun, that Proteſtants have ſeparated themſelves from the communion of the Catholik Church. For the true real Catholik Church inſtituted by Chriſt is a company of Chriſtians ſpread over the world; and intirely vnited in profeſſion of his faith, and communion

L. D. p. 246. The Romane Church it ſelf, is a Catholik.

communion of his Sacraments under his officers And he instituted no company of Christians, who were divided in any part of his faith, or in communion of his Sacraments, or in his officers. Because all such divided companies are companies of Heretiks or Schismatiks, which kind of companies, he no more instituted, than he instituted heresie or Schism. And a multitude, or rather multitudes, of such, though spread over the world, are no Catholik Church, nor true real Church at all, because they are not united in all the substantiall parts of a Church, otherwise than by imagination of some Protestants. Who, because (as they suppose) are united in all fundamentall points of faith, are sufficiently united in the substance of a true Church. Whereas union in profession of *b* all Christs faith, and not in some part thereof onely, and union

b See S. Austin in

union in communion of Sacraments, and publick worſhip of God, under his lawfull Miniſters, are the eſſentiall parts of Chriſts true Church. And no Church is both ſpread over the world, and thus one, but the univeſall Roman Church; therefore none truly Catholik, but ſhe. For ſhe, (as Proteſtants confeſſe *l.* 2. *de authore*, &c. *c.* 3.) hath been ſpread for many hundred years over the world, and now is ſpread in Europe, Aſia, Africa, America, which no other Chriſtian Church is, and alſo intirely one in all her ſubſtantiall parts, as in profeſſion of faith, communion of Sacraments, under lawfull Miniſters, which no other multitude. (or rather multitudes) ſpread over the world, is. And ſurely, it is meer wilfullneſſe to deny her to be the Catholik Church, which being a *true Church* *Pſal.* 54. *& epiſt.* 48.

in

in substance, (as L. D. and protestants generaly do confesse) is also realy spread over the world, and really vnited in all her members, in all the substantial parts of the Church, in profession of faith, in communion of Sacraments, and Ministrie. For what wanteth such a Church to be the Catholik Church, or what multitude of Christians can be the Catholik Church, if she be not? And as (S. Austin said to the Donatists) either take this Church or give us a better. *Aut det aut accipiat de unit* c. 6. And it is meer dotage to think, that those multitudes of Christians, who are divided in all the said substantiall parts of the Church, can be one substantiall church, which Christ instituted, Did he in.

Shew us a likelier Catholik Church, than the Roman.

Dotage, to think that they are, one substantiall Church, who are divided in all the substantiall

inſtitute a Church divided in profeſſiō of his faith, in communion of his Sacraments, or his officers? No no, ſuch a Church is inſtituted of the Spirit of diviſion, and is, *regnum contra ſe diviſum, quod deſolabitur*. As it were dotage alſo to think that the Catholik Church can conſiſt of hereticall, and Schiſmaticall churches, as L. D. cannot deny that the Grecian, Arminian, Ethiopian churches are, unleſs he will deny his 39 Articles, to which he hath ſworn. For *Catholik*, is oppoſit *to heretik*, and *ſciſmatik*, more than white is to black, and nothing can conſiſt of that really, which is oppſite unto it. I ſay *really*, for by imagination we may *Humano capiti cervicem jungere equinam*, and ſo my L. D. joynes Catholiks

parts of a Church. Math. 12. *Or that the Cath. Church can conſiſt of heretiks and ſchiſmatiks.*

Contradictory oppoſite.

Chatholicks, heretiks, and ſchiſmatiks in one imaginary Catholick Church, but to be in ſuch an imaginary Catholik Church, is to ſmall purpoſe, becauſe to obtain ſalvation, we muſt be in the reall Catholik Church, which, the only is, which is really a true Church in ſubſtance, really ſpread over the world, and reallly united in all the ſubſtantiall parts of the Church. And ſuch, onely is the Roman CatholikChurch, as is evident to the eye. Wherefore it is vain to liken us to the *c* Donatiſts, who limited the Catholik Church to thoſe of their communion in Afrik: For the communion of the Roman Church is over the world. When the Donataſtits ſaid, that the Catholik Church of that time, was but a part of the Church, as Proteſtants ſay now of the Roman,

c See S. *Auſtin de vnit. c.9.*

d L. 2. cont. Petil. c. 38.

man, S. d Auſtin laughed at them, and asked them, how can that be a part, which is ſpred over the world? And the Roman church is far more ſpread over the world now, than the catholik church was in S. Auſtins time. Beſide, Luther and the firſt Proteſtants ſeparated themſelves from all chriſtian Churches in the world in communion of Sacraments; and therefore ſeparated themſelves from the Catholik church, if then there was any Catholick church: And Proteſtants now continew the ſaid ſeparation, for they communicate not in Sacraments with any of the ancient Chriſtian churches. And whereas L. D. ſaith p. 246. that *Proteſtants make the communion of the Chriſtian church thrice more Catholik, than the Romaniſts do, and mantein communion with thriſe ſo many Chriſtians, as they do*, cannot be

be true of communion in Sacraments, because Protestants communicate in Sacraments with none of those ancient *Christians*, but merely of communion (or to speak more properly) of union in some fundamental points of faith. Which union is no way sufficient to the union of the Catholik church instituted by *Christ*; For the union of the Catholik church, or of the church instituted by *Christ* is really entire and whole in all points of faith, in communion of his Sacraments, and his Officers, whereas the union of L.D. imaginarie *Catholik* church, is a true and real disunion in all the substantial parts of *Christs* church, to wit in profession of faith, communion of Sacraments, and ministers.

Act. 2. 1 *Cor.* 11. 6. *Cant.* 6.

2. And whereas, L.D. p. 246. saith, he shewed before, by the canons of their

their church, that they have not ſeparated themſelves ſimply and abſolutely from the communion of any particular church, even the Roman it ſelf, *ſo far as it is Catholik*, but onely from their errors, either he confoundeth *communion* with *profeſſion of faith*, or he ſpeaketh manifeſt untruthes. For it is evident, they have ſeparated themſelves ſimply, and abſolutely, nay wholly from the Roman church, in communion, in Sacraments and publik worſhip of God. And though by *Communion*, he mean *Profeſſion of faith*, yet Proteſtants have ſimply and abſolutely ſeparated themſelves from the Roman church in a ſubſtantial part of her, to wit, *Profeſſion of faith*. And to ſeparate from one in a ſubſtantial part, is to ſeparate ſimply and abſolutely; I grant, they have not wholly ſeparated themſelves from the Profeſſion of faith of the Roman church, becauſe

To separate from any substantiall part, is to separate absolutely.

because they hold a part thereof: but yet they have simply separated themselves from her in a substantial part of her. And to separate from one in any substantiall part, is simply to separate from it. And her entire profession of faith, is essentiall or substantiall to her. L. D. addeth p. cit. *That it was not they, but the Court of Rome it self, that separated England from her communion by her excommunications, for denying their spirituall Souerainytie by divine right, before the reformation made by Protestants.* To which I reply, if the Court of Rome excommunicated England for denying the Popes souerainytie to be *divini juris*, England divided it self from Rome in profession of faith,

faith, before Rome excommunicated it. And though by only deniall of the Popes Soverainyty by divine right, England, became not perfectly Protestant, yet it became substantially Protestant. For this, in the judgement of learned Protestants is to be substantially a Protestant, as I have shewed l. 1. *de Authore Protest. Ecclesiæ*, cap. 5. Where, to denie the Popes authority, is counted the foundation of the protestanticall building.

3. Secondly saith L. D. p. 246. *we are charged with Schism, for not obeying of the decrees of the Councel of Trent, but that* (saith he) *was neither general, nor yet Patriarchal, nor free, nor lawful.* Not generall, becaus there was not one

L. D. judgeth a general Councel.

one Bishop out of all the other Patriarchates, nor generally admitted by Romanists themselves. But, beside that there were some Grecian Bishops in that councel. To be a general catholik councel, it is not necessary, that Bishops or Patriarchats, which, are become hereticall or schismaticall, should be there: it sufficeth, that all Bishops catholik be called. Yea *Camden* in the life of Q. Elisabeth an 1561. writeth, that Pope Pius 4. did invite even *Princes, adversaries to the Roman Religion*, and sent *Abbot Martineng* to Q. Elisabeth, with most loving letters to her, but was not admitted to enter into England. And the same Popes Nuncio in France, delt with her Embassadour there, that she would send Embassadours to

Vega *de justific. c.* 5. p. 9.

to that Councel, and that the Kings of *France*, *Spain*, and *Portugal*, perſwaded her to follow rather the generall Councel of Trent, than private mens opinions. and as for matters of faith, that councel is obeyed of all Catholiks, though not for ſome matters of fact. He proveth it, not to have been free, becauſe *the Accuſer, was the Judge*. But how can he ſay, that was not free, where *two or three ſafe conducts* were granted to Proteſtants to come and go, when they would, and to diſpute as they would, and the councell bound it ſelfe to determine nothing, but by the holy *Scripture, tradition of Apoſtles, approved Councels, concent of the Catholik Church, and authorities of holy Fathers*. Doth not

Great fr? uor to call a Parliament to judge notorious rebells.

L. D. p. 254. in a matter of hereſie &c?

not he professe himself guilty, who refuseth to be judged by such? Is it not freedom enough, to be judged by such? It was not the Pope, who was there to be their judg but the Councel. and if the Pope had been their judg: it had been no more unjust, then for a King to be judg of notorious rebells. And as in the cause of notorious Rebells, it were a great favour for a King to call a Parliament to judg their cause, to hear what they could say for themselves: so it was an extraordinary favour of the sea Apostolik, to call a general Councel to condemne Protestants, and to hear what they could say for themselves, seeing their heresies were notorious, and had been heretofore lawfully condemned. Nor ever was such favor

fined by the Church the sentence of a judge, is not necessary.

* *See. l. 2. Callot. C. 23.*

favor ſhewed to heretiks before. He proveth again the Councel was not free, becauſe it ought to be in Germany, *actor ſequitur forum rei*. As if Trent were not in Germany, or firſt accuſers had not been Proteſtants? Did not they accuſe the Pope, before he accuſed them? He addeth, that in every judgment there ought to be foure diſtinct perſons. The Accuſer, the witneſs, the guilty perſon, and the judg. *But the Pope was the Accuſer, the witneſs, the accuſed, and the judg.* I anſwer, that in doubtfull cauſes this is true, but not in notorious rebellions. For in ſuch cauſes, there need no accuſer, nor witneſs, it ſufficeth, that there be the guilty perſon, and his lawfull judg, and ſuch was the cauſe of Proteſtants, who were condemned, not

Greater favor ſhewed by the Councel of Tr. to Proteſtants, then ever was to any heretiks.

only of the Councel of Trent, but also the Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom they appealed: Neither were the Bishops of that Councel, Ministers of the Pope, more than Barons of the Parliament, are Ministers of the King in condemning notorious rebells. Lastly he addeth p. 249. *that none can be lawfully condemned before he be heard.* which is false in notorious criminals: for as himself saith C. 2. p. 12. *some things are so evident, that the judgment of a Superior is not needfull.* Besides Protestants might have been heard as long as they would, if they would hav used their safe cōducts. But I pray you, when Protestants condemned both the Pope, and Church of Rome, were not the same men their Accusers, witnesses, and judges? were they not condemned before they were heard? Who were the Accusers, Witnesses, and Judges, of the Pope

Pope, in the Parliament An. 1534? were they not *K.* Henry himself, and his Miniſters, was not the Pope there condemned before he was heard? had he any ſafe conduct given to him to defend himſelf? How then was he lawfully condemned? was not this quite contrary to the proceedings of the Councel of Trent? And yet as L.D. ſaith *K.* * Henry proceeed with due moderation, and form of juſtice, and the Councel of Trent, with none: what is this but to call light darkneſſe, and darkneſſe light? How Proteſtants proceded againſt Catholiks, Luther telleth in c. 17. Geneſis: *in the buſineſſe of the Goſpel, we concluded againſt all papal impietie, without form of law, we accuſed not the Pope, nor could, becauſe there was no Judge*

* *c. 6. p. 106.*

Luther proceeded without form of law.

4. A third objection L. D. proposeth p. 249. that Protestants have left their lawfull Patriarch, which we will omit, because we have spoken enough of that before. But our most forcible argumēt against themselves, L. D. omitteth. namely, their grant, that the Roman Church, *is a true Church in substance, the Spouse of Christ, his mystical body, his tabernacle, his kingdom, their Mother Church, who bore them in Christ, who hath all that is necessary to salvation, even the kernel of Christianity, in which doubtless salvation withall security may be had, which hath an antidote against all errors. And withall, that no Church is to be left, in which salvation may be had.* For what seek we in a Church, but salvation? All which I have clearly proved in the *Protestants plain Confession of the truth of Roman Church*, 3. 4. 6. 9. 10. and all which L. D.

L. D. ſhould not have deſſembled, ſeeing he hath read the book, but perhaps he thought it too hard to anſwer. For indeed what juſt and neceſſary cauſe of revolt for ſalvation can ſhe give, who is *The true Church, the Spouſe of Chriſt, his Myſtical body, his kingdome, who is the Mother Church of Chriſtians, who hath all that is neceſſary to ſalvation, nay ſecurity of ſalvation?* Or where ſhall we find ſalvation or ſecurity thereof, if not in the true Church of Chriſt, which is his Spouſe, his taberncle, his kingdome, who hath all that is neceſſary to ſalvation an ſecurity of ſalvation? And what ſecurity, nay what poſſibility of ſalvation for them who have left ſuch a Church? what quiet of conſcience can they have, what clear and evident proof muſt they have, to ſtand againſt the authority of ſuch a church? And it is a frivolous excuſe,

excuſe, which L.D. giveth p. 8. that they having not ſeparated themſelves from the Roman Church, *as it is a part of the Catholik*. For it ſufficeth, that they have ſeparated themſelves from the ſubſtance of the Church of Chriſt, as it ſufficed, that none went out of the ark of Noe, whoſoever, or for whatſoever one go out of the true Church, there is no ſalvation, no more, than there was out of the ark of Noe, whoſoever, or for whatſoever one went out. To be voluntarly out of the ſociety of Chriſt, preciſely is to periſh. And they are realy out of any Church, who are out of any ſubſtantial part of her, namely out of her profeſſion of faith, or her communion in Sacraments, or her Miniſtres. And Proteſtants are out of all thoſe three ſubſtantial parts of the Roman Church, as is evident. Beſides, Fathers, not onely ſay, *there is no ſalvation*

ſalvation out of the communion of the Church, as S. Auſtin, l. 1. de baptiſmo c. 8. S. Hierom Epiſt. 57. And it is clear, that Proteſtants are out of the communion of Roman Church. S. Auſtin oſtentimes objected to the Donatiſts, that of the Scripture: *Malus filius; juſtum ſe dicit, exitum autem ſuum non abluit.* And yet Donatiſts granted not the Church of their time to be a true church in ſubſtance, as Proteſtants grant the Roman Church of this time to be. And which L. D. granteth in theſe words. c. p. 159. *Our religion is the ſame it was; our holy Orders the ſame they were in ſubſtance, differing only from that they were formerly, as a body purged from it ſelfe before it was purged.* And the ſame he hath. c. 2. p. 29. and

l. 1. cont. Greſcon. c. 33.

l. 2. cont. Gaudent. c. 3.

L. de. unbaptiſ. c. 15. epiſt. 48.

Pro-

Protestants generally as I shew l. 1. de Authore Protest. c. 2. and l. 1. of fundam. and not fund. c. 5. and in Protest. plain confes. c. 3. For if the Rom. Church, religion, and orders, were in substance the same with the Protestant, salvation might be had in the Roman Church, and Protestants reformation was not necessary to salvation, and consequently (according to the common doctrine of protestants) not just, but Schismatical. For as Calvin 4. c. 1. *S.* 20. saieth, *God so much esteemeth the communion of his Church, as he accounteth him a renegate and forsaker of his religion, whosoever obstinately separateth himself from any Christian society, which keepeth the true Ministry of the word, and Sacraments.* As surely Protestants must

See. perkins *in Symbol. col.* 754. *in Gathol. Refer col.* 470. *Zanchius de Eccles. c.* 7.

must allow the Roman-ſociety doth, if her church, her religion, her orders, be true in ſubſtance, and the ſame with theirs. And §. 12. *There may ſome vice creep, even into the adminiſtration of the word, and Sacraments, which ought not to alienate us from her communion.*

And 16. *Either we muſt pardon errors in thoſe things, which may be unknown, without violating the ſumme of religion, or without loſſe of* * *ſalvation.* The ſame ſay others, as I ſhewed *de Author. Proteſt.* l. 1. c. 1. The ſame muſt all thoſe mean, who ſay, that a juſt cauſe of ſeparation *is neceſſary*, for they mean neceſſary to ſalvation, though they ad not the word *Salvation.* And in effect all Proteſtants profeſs, when they, ſay, they went or live

Errors not fundamental muſt be pardoned.

* L. D. p. 279. 280.

Chilling p. 7.

L. 1. *ad*

live out of the Roman church to save their souls. But we say to Protestants, as S. *Austin.* to the Donatists: *If ours be religion, yours is superstition.* And again: *Seeing they approve that Church, with which we communicate, and evidently they communicate not, they confess themselves overcome, and clearly shew to you, if you be wise, which you should forsake, which hold.* Cannot salvation be had in a church, which holdeth all that is necessary to salvation? and may a church be forsaken, where salvation may be had? what seek we in a church but salvation: Feild l. 3. de *Eccl. cap.* 47. saith *Surely, if he can prove that, we confess it* (Roman) *to be the church, he needeth not use any other argument.* And that they confesse this, I have shewed l. of *protestants plain confession* cap. 3.

Gaudent. c. 11. epist. 152. & ad Dovat. post collat.

to

to which I remit the Reader.

5. But what pretenſe ſoever, Proteſtants can make for their ſeparation from the Roman churches communion, what pretenſe can they make for their ſeparation in communion of Sacraments, from all chriſtian churches in the world? For when they firſt ſeparated themſelves from communion in Sacraments with the Roman church, they ſeparated themſelves alſo from communion in Sacraments, from all chriſtian churches then in the world. For they did not joyn with any preexiſtent chriſtian church, in her communion of Sacraments, but inſtituted a new one of their own, which niether themſelves had before, nor any other chriſtian church, as I have evi-

Can L.D. *ſend communicatorie letters to any of the ancient Churches.*

Proteſtants

dently

separated from all the world.

dently proved by their confessions l.2.*de Authore Protestantismi* c.2. Here I will onely cite the words of Calvin Epistola 141. *We have been forced to make a separation from all the world.* And 4. Institut. c.18.§.18. *The idolatrous Mass hath so possessed all kings and people, from the first to the last, that they put the prow and poup of their salvation in it alone.* To which I adjoin the late like confession of Chilling worth c.5.p.237. *As for the externall communion of the visible Church, we have without scruple formerly granted, that Protestants did forsake it.* And p.274. *What do you conclude from hence, but that seeing there was no visible Church but corrupted, Luther forsaking the externall communion of the*

From the communion of the visible Church. See him also p.262.

From externall communion of

the corrupted church, could not but forſake the externall communion of the Catholick church. Wel, let this be granted, what will come of it? What, that Luther muſt be a Schiſmatick? by no means. For not every ſeparation but onely a carſeleſs ſeparation from the communion of the church, we mantain to be ſchiſmatical. And p. 291. *Neither is it improbable, that it may be lawfull: and noble for one man to oppoſe* (in faith) *the world.* And Potter ſec. 2. p. 48. *Some ſeparation* (voluntarie) *from all viſible churches doth not exclude from heaven.* Behold how Proteſtants ſeparated themſelves *from the whole world, from the firſt to the laſt, from the external communion of the viſible church, forſook the external communion of the Catholik Church.* And can there be juſt and neceſſa-

the cath. Church.

See S. Auſtin *l.* 2. *cont.* Petil. *c.* 8.

ry

ry cause to separate from the whole world, from the first to the last Christian, from the external communion of the Catholik church? What greater pride, with more desperate presumption can be imagined? L.D. fore cried, *God forbid, that they forsake the Catholick church.* Laude sec. 28. p. 139. saith *There can be no just cause to make a Shcism from the whole church,* so Potter sec. 3. p. 4. 74. and here *Chillingworth* in plain terms granteth, that *Luther* did it. And it is evident, for he did not adjoin himself in communion of Sacraments to any Christian church, which was before his revolt from the Roman. Surely *Whitaker* l. 10. contra *Dureum* sec. 30. sayth: *He goes far from the Gospel, who saith that the whole world can conspire against Christ.* And yet Protestants must say so, because they cannot name, and prove any part of the world, with which *Luther* com-

communicated in Sacraments, when he left communicating with the Roman church. And *communion in Sacraments is as well of the essence of the church, as is profession of faith. For it is put in the definition of the church as well as profession of faith, and without it, mere schismaticks were not excluded out of the Church.

* *See this proved l. 2. de distinc. fundam. & non fundam. p. 12.*

6. P. 266. L. D. endeavoureth to prove the lawfull ordination of the first Bishops in Q. *Elisabeths* time, by the testimony of publick registers, and confession of F. Olcorn, who was convinced at the sight of them. But first, wherefore were not these Registers shewed before K. *James* his time? wherefore were they not alleadged by Jewel, when D. Harding in fresh memorie objected to him, that he was not consecrated

ſecrated Biſhop at all? Why not by Biſhop Horn, when the ſame was objected to him by D. Stapleton? Why not ſhewed, when Biſhop Boner excepted againſt the ſame Horn at the bar, that he was no true Biſhop, and thereby ſaved his life, which was much ſought of Proteſtants? what need had the Biſhops to deſire, that their ordination ſhould by Parlament be judged ſufficient eight yeares after, if there were ſo good proof of it by Regiſters.

No true Prieſt without true ſacrifice, nor true Biſhops, without true Prieſthood.

Witak. cont. 2. q. 9 c. 3. con. 4 q. c. 2. Morton. l. 4. de Miſſa c. 1. Chilling. c. 2. p. 52.

That *F. Oldcorn* being in hold for the pouder treaſon, and judging others by himſelf, ſhould ſay theſe Regiſters were authentical, is no mervel. But of Proteſtant Biſhops ordination we have

Potter. p. 72. *Fulk. Heb. 5.*

ſaid

ſaid enough l. 6. *Florum Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ*, c. 1. to which I remit the Reader. For the preſent, it may ſuffice, that they are not ordered to offer true ſubſtantial ſacrifice as ſome of them confeſſe, and as it appeareth by their ordination, in which there is no word of offering ſacrifice, but onely of * *diſpenſing the word and Sacraments*, nor yet any intention in the orderer to give ſuch power, and not being ordered to offer true ſubſtantial ſacrifice, they cannot be true ſubſtantial Prieſts, and not being true ſubſtantial Prieſts, they cannot be true ſubſtantial (but at moſt metaphorical) Biſhops. For as Latimer truly ſaith in Fox his act. p. 1324. *The name of a Prieſt, importeth ſacrifice.* Or as D. *Rainolds* ſaith *Hath relation to ſacrifice.* And the name of

* L. D. p. 267.

*Conference p. 539. Sacerdos ſacrum dans.

a Bishop; who is *Summus sacerdos*, includeth the nature of a *Priest*. Wherefore, as the sacrifice, which Protestant Priests offer, is but metaphorical sacrifice, so they are but metaphorical *Priests*, and consequently, but metaphoricall Bishops.

7. I omit the surveying of L. D. tenth and last Chapter, because therein he bringeth no new cause to excuse the Protestants Schism, or to condemn the Catholick church, but bemoanes himself, that his Protestant Brethren in England, do not better supplie the necessities and wants of their fugitive Brethren, fled into strange countries, and proposeth a way of uniting Christian churches, by binding to professe onely fundamental points. But this way, of uniting Christian churches is impossible. First, because there are no such fundamental points of faith,

faith, as Protestants imagin, that is such as are sufficient to saving faith, true church, and way of salvation, though other points of faith sufficiently purposed, be not believed, as I have clearly proved * otherwhere. Secondly because though there were such fundamentall points, yet seing Protestants confesse, they, know not which they are, one cannot know by them what church holds so much, as is necessary to constitute a true church. And indeed till Prot: have exhibited and proved a particular & distinct List of points of Faith, wherein all fundamentals are contained, and nothing unfundamentall, it is but a meer hypocrisie, and worse, a malicious juggling, to deceive the common People (for whose souls they must answer) by a fair flourish of communicating in fun-

*See l. 2. de distinc. fundam. & non fundam. c. 3. 4. 8. c. 1. & 2. c. 6.

fundamentals with the Catholick church, when they can neither tell them, where that church is, nor which those fundamentals. So that in fine they communicate with they know not whom, and agree in they know what. Thirdly, because (as I have proved (loc.cit.) all points of faith sufficiently proposed, are essentiall and fundamental to a true church, and way of salvation; nor any such point can be denyed without infidelity, and disbeleeving the veracity of God, as even Protestants some times confesse. And such as are infidels, can not be members of Christs true church Therefore the agreement in fundamentals according to the Protestants sense, is no means of uniting all Christians into one church. The onely secure way, is that, which God giveth by the Prophet Esay. 1. *Attendite ad petram, unde excisi estis.* This is that rock, which

(as

(as S. Auſtin ſaith, *non vincunt ſuperbæ inferorum portæ*, much leſſe hereticall or ſchiſmatical enterpriſes, I ask not, what offence or ſcandall ſome Popes have given, for I know that the firſt and the beſt Pope, that ever was, *reprehenſibilis erat, & cogebat gentes judaizare.* Galat. 2. but what occaſion of revolt have you by Papal authority, that is, by Epiſcopal, or Paſtoral authority over all Chriſtians, *in gravioribus cauſis Eccleſiaſticis & præſertim fidei*, which is the authority Catholick faith attributeth to Popes *jure divino*, and which ancient Popes ſtill either practiſed or challenged, as it is to be ſeen in Pope *Victor*, *P. Stephen*, *P. Damaſcus*, P. *Innocent* 1. and others, whome *Bellarmin* citeth *l.* 3. *de*

What the Popes ſupremacy is.

Popes ſupremacie, neceſſarie for unitie in the Church.

verbo

verbo Dei c.7. And such authority is absolutely necessary to keep unity in the Church. For if as S. *Hierom* saith, Christ made one *head among the twelve, to avoid Schism*, how much more necessary is such a head in the universall Church? And for want of such a head, Protestants have no unity in their Church, nor hope of any. And as Puritans tell our English Protestants, such Papal authority, necessary followeth of their Episcopall and Archiepiscopall authority. For if there ought to be a Bishop in a Diocese, and Archbishop in a Province, why not a Pope (who is but supreme Bishop) in all the churches? Is or the universall Church *homogenea* with particular Churches? And

Lib. 2. cont. Jov.

Galvin in Antid. sess. 7. Whitaker. cont. 2. q. 6. c. 2. laude Relat. sect. 38. Potter sec. p. 38. Chilling. c. 5. p. 279. Martyr in

Me-

Melanthon Centuria epistolarum theolog. epistola 74. saith: *As there are some Bishops, who govern divers Churches, the Bishop of Rome governeth all Bishops. And this Canonicall policy, I think no wise man doth disallow, or ought to dislike. For the Monarchy of the Bishops of Rome, in my judgment, is profitable to this end, that unity in doctrine be preserved. Wherefore we would easily assent to this article of the Popes Supremacie, if we did agree in other matters.* Thus he confesseth, that the Popes Supremacy is profitable. But howsoever L. D. will like this judgment of Melanthon,

in c. 19. Judic. Melanthon allowed the Popes supremacie.

So also Hus in Luther tom. 2. in assert. art. 30. & apud Coccium tom. 5. p. 18. 19. Prisciam 26. See Montague orig. Eccles. part. post. p. 115.

he ought to shew how the foresaid Papal authority *gravioribus causis*, can be a just and necessary cause of revolt from it. Is it
L.D.c.c.2. against any of the three
p.15. Creeds, or of the first four generall Councels, or against any article fundamentall and necessary to salvation? And if not, how can division for it, be excused from Schism, seeing (as Protestants teach) nothing can excuse division of the Church, but necessity of salvation? Or how was it any cause of Luthers and the Protestants first revolt from the Roman Church, when at that time, it was not as much as pretended? And (as I have said) L.D. must not onely clear his present English Protestants from Schism, but also the first Protestants, and shew, they had then just cause to forsake the Roman Church, else he must confess that at least, (as S. Optate l.

ſaid to the Donatiſts) they are *hæredes Schiſmaticorum.* Nay he muſt prove (which he hath not attempted, but ignorantly or ſophiſtically ſuppoſed) that there can be any juſt cauſe of Schiſm, or of rending or dividing a true Church in ſubſtance, in any ſubſtantial part of her. For (as I have often repeated) that is in parte to deſtroy her, and there can be no juſt cauſe to deſtroy in any ſort a true Church, which is the myſtical body of Chriſt, Either therefore prove, that the Roman Church is no true Church, or never pretend a juſt cauſe of dividing her in any ſubſtantial part, as Proteſtants have in all her ſubſtantial parts, namely, in her profeſſion of faith, in her communion of Sacraments, and in her Officers, and thereby have committed manifeſt Schiſm. Talk therefore no more of any cauſe, which the Roman church may

may have given you to depart from her communion, till you have proved, she is no true church of God in substance, which you can not say, because you teach she is the *same Church in substance with yours*, or till you have proved, that there can be just cause to rent a true church of God in her substantiall parts, which is not to reform or purge, but to destroy her. And this alone may suffice to refute your whole book. For in it, you suppose, that there can be just cause to rent a true church of God in her substantial partes which we shall never grant, nor you ever prove. Beside, it implieth plain contradiction, that a true Church, in substance, should give just cause to alter any substantial part of her. For a true church in sub-

c.2. p.29.c.6. p.159.

See this proved l.fund. & non fund.c.13.

ſubſtance cannot give cauſe to forſake any of her ſubſtantial parts, becauſe this were not to purge or reform her, but to deſtroy her ſubſtance, ſince any ſubſtantial part o a thing being changed, the thin it ſelf is deſtroied, for a thing is nothing els, but all its ſubſtantial parts united. And this I inculcated in the Preface of the Reader, and repeat it here again, that both you and he may take notice of it, and well ponder and conſider it, becauſe it is a main point, and ſheweth plainly, that the Rom. Church being granted to be *a true Church in ſuſtance*, it neither hath given nor could give Proteſtants juſt cauſe to ſeparate from her communion in Sacraments, and publick worſhip of God, which is a part of her ſubſtance, as I have proved clearly l. 2. of fundam. and not fund. c. 12. and that con-

consequently, protestants in so separating from her, are true Schismaticks.

FINIS.

Errata of the Preface.

*Pag.*4.*l.*22. *read* for.*p.*5.*l.*21. *read* that. *p.*11.*l.*1. *r.*not clearly *p.*13.*l.*12.*r.*to *p.*17.*l.*21.*r.*if.

Of the Book.

P.24.*l.*12.*r.*neceſſity.*p* 35.*l.*8. *r.*Biſhops.*p.*54.*l.*8. *r.* Conflandi *p.* 64.*l.*12.*r.*thy. *p.*75.l.18.*r.*as is eaſie.*p.*8.9.*l.*27.*r*Roman.ibidem before.*p.*91.*l.*21.*r* to ſuch *p.* 96.*l.*3.*r.*as far as it.*p.*101.*l.*24.*r.*in profeſſion of faith not only.*p.*105.*l.*9.*r.*univerſall. *p.* 106.*l.*12.*r.*Epheſinam.*p.*108.*l.*21.*r.*Princes.*ibid.* *l.* 22.*r.*deny not. *p.*121.*l.*3. *r.*an. *p.*122.*l.*4. *r.* by deputies.*p.*139.*l.*10.*r.*accuſer.*ibid.*l.16.*r.*diſputa. *p.*142.*l.*13.*r.* that *p.*143.*l.*10.16. *r.*proceeded. *p.* 145.l.17.*r.*and ſecurity up.147.*l.*8.*r.*malus.*p.*155 *l.*17.*r.*Olcorne. *p.*155, *l.*14.*r.* Olcorne.*p.*157.*l.*23 *r.*ſacrifice.*p.*159.*l.*21.*r.*jugling.*p.*160.*l.*6. *r.*know not.

The whole ſheet of G.*not figured from* p.114. *to* H.115.

consequently, protestants in so separating from her, are true Schismaticks.

FINIS.

Errata of the Preface.

Pag. 4. *l.* 22. *read* for. *p.* 5. *l.* 21. *read* that. *p.* 11. *l.* 1. *r.* not clearly *p.* 13. *l.* 12. *r.* to *p.* 17. *l.* 21. *r.* if.

Of the Book.

P. 24. *l.* 12. *r.* neceſſity. *p* 35. *l.* 8. *r.* Biſhops. *p.* 54. *l.* 8. *r.* Conflandi *p.* 64. *l.* 12. *r.* thy. *p.* 75. l. 18. *r.* as is eaſie. *p.* 8. 9. *l.* 27. *r* Roman. ibidem before. *p.* 91. *l.* 21. *r* to ſuch *p.* 96. *l.* 3. *r.* as far as it. *p.* 101. *l.* 24. *r.* in profeſſion of faith not only. *p.* 105. *l.* 9. *r.* univerſall. *p.* 106. *l.* 12. *r.* Epheſinam. *p.* 108. *l.* 21. *r.* Princes. *ibid.* *l.* 22. *r.* deny not. *p.* 121. *l.* 3. *r.* an. *p.* 122. *l.* 4. *r.* by deputies. *p.* 139. *l.* 10. *r.* accuſer. *ibid.* *l.* 16. *r.* diſputa. *p.* 142. *l.* 13. *r.* that *p.* 143. *l.* 10. 16. *r.* proceeded. *p.* 145. l. 17. *r.* and ſecurity up. 147. *l.* 8. *r.* malus. *p.* 155 *l.* 17. *r.* Olcorne. *p.* 155, *l.* 14. *r.* Olcorne. *p.* 157. *l.* 23 *r.* ſacrifice. *p.* 159. *l.* 21. *r.* jugling. *p.* 160. *l.* 6. *r.* know not.

The whole ſheet of G. *not figured from* p. 114. *to* H. 115.